00002770

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 05 October, 2018

A

# HISTORY OF GREECE;

FROM THE

EARLIEST PERIOD TO THE CLOSE OF THE GENERATION CONTEMPORARY WITH ALEXANDER THE GREAT.

By GEORGE GROTE.

*A NEW EDITION.*

IN TEN VOLUMES.—VOL. III.

WITH PORTRAIT, MAP, AND PLANS.

LONDON:
JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.
1888.

93.'

2770

# LIST OF PLANS.

Vol. I. Portrait of Author.

Vol. II. Map of Greece.

Vol. IV. (1) Maliac Gulf and Thermopylæ.
(2) Battle of Salamis.
(3) Battle of Platæa.

Vol. V. (1) Battle between Athenian and Peloponnesian Fleet.
(2) Battle of Amphipolis.

Vol. VI. (1) Syracuse—operations of the siege.
(2) Syracuse—when Demosthenes arrived.

Vol. VII. Marches of the Greeks after the Battle of Kunaxa.

Vol. VIII. (1) Battle of Mantineia.
(2) Plan of Syracuse at the invasion of Dion.

Vol. X. (1) Battle of Issus.
(2) African Territory of Carthage.

00002770

# CONTENTS OF VOLUME III.

## PART II.—HISTORICAL GREECE CONTINUED.

### CHAPTER XIII.

ASIATIC IONIANS.


| | PAGE |
|---|---|
| Twelve Ionic cities in Asia .. | 1 |
| Legendary event called the Ionic migration .. .. .. | *ib.* |
| Emigrants to these cities—diverse Greeks .. .. .. .. | 2 |
| Great differences of dialect among the twelve cities .. .. | 3 |
| Ionic cities really founded by different migrations .. .. | *ib.* |
| Consequences of the mixture of inhabitants in these colonies —more activity—more instability .. .. .. .. | 4 |
| Mobility ascribed to the Ionic race as compared with the Doric — arises from this cause .. .. .. .. | 5 |
| Ionic cities in Asia—mixed with indigenous inhabitants .. | *ib.* |
| Worship of Apollo and Artemis—existed on the Asiatic coast prior to the Greek immigrants —adopted by them .. .. | 6 |
| Pan-Ionic festival and Amphiktyony on the promontory of Mykalé .. .. .. .. | 6 |
| Situation of Milêtus—of the other Ionic cities .. .. .. | 7 |
| Territories interspersed with Asiatic villages .. .. .. | *ib.* |
| Magnêsia on the Mæander—Magnêsia on Mount Sipylus | 8 |
| Ephesus—Androklus the Œkist —first settlement and distribution .. .. .. .. | 9 |
| Increase and acquisitions of Ephesus .. .. .. .. | 11 |
| Kolophôn, its origin and history | *ib.* |
| Temple of Apollo at Klarus, near Kolophôn—its legends .. | 12 |
| Lebedus, Teôs, Klazomenæ, &c. | 13 |
| Internal distribution of the inhabitants of Teôs .. .. | 14 |
| Erythræ and Chios .. .. .. | 15 |
| Klazomenæ—Phôkæa .. .. | 16 |
| Smyrna .. .. .. .. | *ib.* |


### CHAPTER XIV.

ÆOLIC GREEKS IN ASIA.


| | |
|---|---|
| Twelve cities of Æolic Greeks .. | 18 |
| Their situation—eleven near together on the Elæitic Gulf .. | *ib.* |
| Legendary Æolic migration . | 19 |
| Kymê—the earliest as well as the most powerful of the twelve | 20 |

## CHAPTER XIV.—*continued.*


| | PAGE |
|---|---|
| Magnêsia ad Sipylum .. .. | 20 |
| Lesbos .. .. .. .. | 21 |
| Early inhabitants of Lesbos before the Æolians .. .. | 22 |
| Æolic establishments in the region of Mount Ida .. .. | *ib.* |
| Continental settlements of Lesbos and Tenedos .. .. .. | 23 |
| Ante-Hellenic inhabitants in the region of Mount Ida—Mysians and Teukrians .. .. .. | *ib.* |
| Teukrians of Gergis .. .. | 24 |
| Mitylênê—its political dissensions —its poets .. .. .. | 25 |
| Power and merit of Pittakus .. | 26 |
| Alkæus the poet—his flight from battle .. .. .. .. | *ib.* |
| Bitter opposition of Pittakus and Alkæus in internal politics .. .. .. .. | 27 |
| Pittakus is created Æsymnete, or Dictator of Mitylênê .. .. | *ib.* |


## CHAPTER XV.

### Asiatic Dorians.


| | |
|---|---|
| Asiatic Dorians—their Hexapolis | 29 |
| Other Dorians, not included in the Hexapolis .. .. .. | 30 |
| Exclusion of Halikarnassus from the Hexapolis .. .. .. | 30 |


## CHAPTER XVI.

### Natives of Asia Minor with whom the Greeks became connected.


| | |
|---|---|
| Indigenous nations of Asia Minor —Homeric geography.. .. | 31 |
| Features of the country .. .. | 32 |
| Names and situations of the different people .. .. | 33 |
| Not originally aggregated into large kingdoms or cities .. | *ib.* |
| River Halys—the ethnographical boundary. Syro-Arabians eastward of that river .. | 34 |
| Thracian race—in the north of Asia Minor .. .. .. | *ib.* |
| Ethnical affinities and migrations .. .. . .. | 35 |
| Partial identity of legends .. | 37 |
| Phrygians .. .. .. .. | 38 |
| Their influence upon the early Greek colonists .. .. .. | 39 |
| Greek musical scale—partly borrowed from the Phrygians .. | *ib.* |
| Phrygian music and worship among the Greeks in Asia Minor .. .. .. .. | 41 |
| Character of Phrygians, Lydians, and Mysians .. .. .. | 42 |
| Primitive Phrygian king or hero Gordius .. .. .. .. | 44 |
| Midas .. .. .. .. .. | *ib.* |


## CHAPTER XVII.

### Lydians.—Medes.—Cimmerians.—Scythians.


| | |
|---|---|
| Lydians—their music and instruments .. .. .. .. | 46 |
| They and their capital Sardis unknown to Homer .. .. | *ib.* |
| Early Lydian kings .. .. .. | 47 |
| Kandaulês and Gygês .. .. | 48 |
| The Mermnad dynasty succeeds to the Herakleid .. .. | 48 |
| Legend of Gygês in Plato .. .. | *ib.* |
| Feminine influence running through the legends of Asia Minor .. .. .. .. | 49 |

## CHAPTER XVII.—*continued.*


PAGE

Distribution of Lydia into two parts—Lydia and Torrhêbia 50
Proceedings of Gygês .. .. *ib.*
His son and successor Ardys .. 51
Assyrians and Medes .. .. *ib.*
First Median king—Dêiokês .. 53
His history composed of Grecian materials, not Oriental .. 55
Phraortês—Kyaxarês .. .. 56
Siege of Nineveh—invasion of the Scythians and Cimmerians .. 59
The Cimmerians .. .. .. *ib.*
The Scythians .. .. .. *ib.*
Grecian settlements on the coast of the Euxine .. .. 61
Scythia as described by Herodotus .. .. .. .. *ib.*
Tribes of Scythians .. .. .. 62
Manners and worship .. .. 64
Scythians formidable from numbers and courage .. .. 66
Sarmatians .. .. .. .. 67
Tribes east and north of the Palus Mæotis .. .. .. *ib.*
Tauri in the Crimea—Massagetæ 69
Invasion of Asia by Scythians and Cimmerians .. .. .. *ib.*
Cimmerians driven out of their country by the Scythians .. 70
Difficulties in the narrative of Herodotus .. .. .. 71

PAGE

Cimmerians in Asia Minor .. 73
Scythians in Upper Asia .. .. 76
Expulsion of these Nomads, after a temporary occupation .. 77
Lydian kings Sadyattês and Alyattês—war against Milêtus .. .. .. .. .. 78
Sacrilege committed by Alyattês —oracle—he makes peace with Milêtus .. .. .. .. 79
Long reign—death—and sepulchre of Alyattês .. .. .. *ib.*
Crœsus .. .. .. .. .. 80
He attacks and conquers the Asiatic Greeks .. .. .. *ib.*
Want of co-operation among the Ionic cities .. .. .. 81
Unavailing suggestion of Thalês —to merge the twelve Ionic cities into one Pan-Ionic city at Teôs .. .. .. .. 82
Capture of Ephesus .. .. .. *ib.*
Crœsus becomes king of all Asia westward of the Halys .. 83
New and important æra for the Hellenic world—commencing with the conquests of Crœsus .. .. .. .. .. 84
Action of the Lydian empire continued on a still larger scale by the Persians .. 85


## CHAPTER XVIII.

### PHŒNICIANS.


Phœnicians and Assyrians—members of the Semitic family of the human race .. .. .. 86
Early presence of Phœnician ships in the Grecian seas—in the Homeric times .. .. .. 87
Situation and cities of Phœnicia 88
Phœnician commerce flourished more in the earlier than in the later times of Greece .. 91
Phœnician colonies—Utica, Carthage, Gadês, &c. .. .. 92
Commerce of the Phœnicians of Gadês—towards Africa on one side and Britain on the other 94
Productive region round Gadês, called Tartêssus .. .. 95
Phœnicians and Carthaginians—the establishments of the latter combined views of empire with views of commerce .. .. .. .. 96

Phœnicians and Greeks in Sicily and Cyprus—the latter partially supplant the former .. 97
Iberia and Tartêssus—unvisited by the Greeks before about 630 B.C. .. .. .. .. 98
Memorable voyage of the Samian Kolæus to Tartêssus .. .. 99
Exploring voyages of the Phokæans, between 630—570 B.C. 101
Important addition to Grecian geographical knowledge, and stimulus to Grecian fancy, thus communicated .. .. 102
Circumnavigation of Africa by the Phœnicians .. .. .. 103
This circumnavigation was really accomplished—doubts of critics, ancient and modern, examined .. .. .. 104
Caravan-trade by land carried on by the Phœnicians .. .. 109

## CHAPTER XIX.

### ASSYRIANS.—BABYLON.


| | PAGE |
|---|---|
| Assyrians — their name rests chiefly on Nineveh and Babylon | 110 |
| Chaldæans at Babylon—order of priests | 111 |
| Their astronomical observations | *ib.* |
| Babylonia—its laborious cultivation and fertility | 113 |
| City of Babylon—its dimensions and walls | 115 |
| Babylon—only known during the time of its degradation—yet even then the first city in Western Asia | 119 |
| Immense command of human labour possessed by the Babylonian kings | 120 |
| Collective civilization in Asia, without individual freedom or development | 121 |
| Graduated contrast between Egyptians, Assyrians, Phœnicians, and Greeks | *ib.* |
| Deserts and predatory tribes surrounding the Babylonians | 122 |
| Appendix, "Nineveh and its Remains," by Mr. Layard | 124 |


## CHAPTER XX.

### EGYPTIANS.


| | PAGE |
|---|---|
| Phœnicians—the link of commerce between Egypt and Assyria | 127 |
| Herodotus—earliest Grecian informant about Egypt | *ib.* |
| The Nile in the time of Herodotus | 128 |
| Thêbes and Upper Egypt — of more importance in early times than Lower Egypt, but not so in the days of Herodotus | 131 |
| Egyptian castes or hereditary professions | 133 |
| Priests | *ib.* |
| The military order | 134 |
| Different statements about the castes | 135 |
| Large town population of Egypt | 137 |
| Profound submission of the people | 138 |
| Destructive toil imposed by the great monuments | *ib.* |
| Worship of animals | 140 |
| Egyptian kings—taken from different parts of the country | *ib.* |
| Relations of Egypt with Assyria | 141 |
| Egyptian history not known before Psammetichus | 143 |
| First introduction of Greeks into Egypt under Psammetichus—stories connected with it | *ib.* |
| Importance of Grecian mercenaries to the Egyptian kings caste of interpreters | 144 |
| Opening of the Kanôpic branch of the Nile to Greek commerce — Greek establishment at Naukratis | 145 |
| Discontents and mutiny of the Egyptian military order | 146 |
| Nekôs — son of Psammetichus — his active operations | 148 |
| Defeated by Nebuchadnezzar at Carchemisch | 149 |
| Psammis, son of Nekôs Apriès | 150 |
| Amasis — dethrones Apriès by means of the native soldiers | 152 |
| He encourages Grecian commerce | *ib.* |
| Important factory and religious establishment for the Greeks at Naukratis | *ib.* |
| Prosperity of Egypt under Amasis | 155 |


## CHAPTER XXI.

### DECLINE OF THE PHŒNICIANS.—GROWTH OF CARTHAGE.


| | PAGE |
|---|---|
| Decline of the Phœnicians—growth of Grecian marine and commerce | 156 |
| Effect of Phœnicians, Assyrians, and Egyptians on the Greek mind.—The alphabet.—The scale of money and weight | 157 |

## CHAPTER XXI.—*continued.*


| | PAGE |
|---|---|
| The gnomon—and the division of the day | 158 |
| Carthage | 159 |
| Æra of Carthage | *ib.* |
| Dominion of Carthage | *ib.* |
| Dido | 160 |
| First known collision of Greeks and Carthaginians—Massalia | 161 |
| Amicable relations between Tyre and Carthage | 162 |


## CHAPTER XXII.

### WESTERN COLONIES OF GREECE—IN EPIRUS, ITALY, SICILY, AND GAUL.


| | |
|---|---|
| Early unauthenticated emigration from Greece | 163 |
| Ante-Hellenic population of Sicily — Sikels — Sikans — Elymi — Phœnicians | *ib.* |
| Œnotria—Italia | 164 |
| Pelasgi in Italy | *ib.* |
| Latins — Œnotrians — Epirots — ethnically cognate | 165 |
| Analogy of languages — Greek, Latin, and Oscan | 167 |
| Grecian colonization of ascertained date in Sicily—commences in 735 B.C. | 169 |
| Cumæ in Campania—earlier—date unknown | *ib.* |
| Prosperity of Cumæ between 700—500 B.C. | 171 |
| Decline of Cumæ from 500 B.C. | *ib.* |
| Revolution—despotism of Aristodêmus | 172 |
| Invasion of Cumæ by Tuscans and Samnites from the interior | *ib.* |
| Rapid multiplication of Grecian colonies in Sicily and Italy, beginning with 735 B.C. | 173 |
| Foundation of Naxos in Sicily by Theoklès | 174 |
| Spot where the Greeks first landed in Sicily—memorable afterwards | *ib.* |
| Ante-Hellenic distribution of Sicily | 175 |
| Foundation of Syracuse | 176 |
| Leontini and Katana | 177 |
| Megara in Sicily | *ib.* |
| Gela | 178 |
| Zanklè, afterwards Messênê (Messina) | *ib.* |
| Sub-colonies — Akræ, Kasmenæ, Kamarina, &c. | 179 |
| Agrigentum, Selinus, Himera, &c. | *ib.* |
| Prosperity of the Sicilian Greeks | 180 |
| Mixed character of the population | 182 |
| Peculiarity of the monetary and statical system, among the Sicilian and Italian Greeks | 182 |
| Sikels and Sikans gradually hellenized | 183 |
| Difference between the Greeks in Sicily and those in Greece Proper | 184 |
| Native population in Sicily not numerous enough to become formidable to the Greek settlers | 186 |
| Sikel prince Duketius | *ib.* |
| Grecian colonies in Southern Italy | 187 |
| Native population and territory | *ib.* |
| Sybaris and Krotôn | 189 |
| Territory and colonies of Sybaris and Krotôn | 190 |
| Epizephyrian Lokri | 191 |
| Original settlers of Lokri—their character and circumstances | *ib.* |
| Treachery towards the indigenous Sikels | 192 |
| Mixture of Sikels in their territory —Sikel customs adopted | 193 |
| Lokrian lawgiver Zaleukus | 194 |
| Rigour of his laws—government of Lokri | *ib.* |
| Rhêgium | 195 |
| Chalkidic settlements in Italy and Sicily—Rhêgium, Zanklè, Naxos, Katana, Leontini | *ib.* |
| Kaulônia and Skyllêtium | 196 |
| Siris or Hêrakleia | *ib.* |
| Metapontium | 197 |
| Tarentum—circumstances of its foundation | 198 |
| The Partheniæ — Palanthus the œkist | 199 |
| Situation and territory of Tarentum | 200 |
| Iapygians | 201 |
| Messapians | 202 |
| Prosperity of the Italian Greeks between 700—500 B.C. | 203 |
| Ascendency over the Œnotrian population | 204 |

## CHAPTER XXII.—*continued.*


PAGE

Krotôn and Sybaris — at their maximum from 560 — 510 B.C. .. .. .. .. 205
The Sybarites — their luxury — their organization, industry, and power .. .. .. 206
Grecian world about 560 B.C.— Ionic and Italic Greeks are then the most prominent among Greeks .. .. .. 208
Consequences of the fall of Sybaris .. .. .. .. 209
Krotoniates — their salubrity, strength, success in the Olympic games, &c. .. .. .. 210
Massalia .. .. .. .. 211


## CHAPTER XXIII.

### Grecian Colonies in and near Epirus.


Korkyra .. .. .. .. 213
Early foundation of Korkyra from Corinth .. .. .. .. 214
Relations of Korkyra with Corinth *ib.*
Relations with Epirus .. .. 215
Ambrakia founded by Corinth .. 216
Joint settlements by Corinth and Korkyra .. .. .. .. 216
Leukas and Anaktorium .. .. *ib.*
Apollonia and Epidamnus .. 218
Relations between these colonies —Commerce .. .. .. 219


## CHAPTER XXIV.

### Akarnanians.—Epirots.


Akarnanians .. .. .. .. 221
Their social and political condition .. .. .. .. 222
Epirots — comprising different tribes, with little or no ethnical kindred .. .. .. 223
Some of these tribes ethnically connected with those of Southern Italy .. .. .. 224
Others, with the Macedonians— impossible to mark the boundaries .. .. .. .. 225
Territory distributed into villages —no considerable cities .. 226
Coast of Epirus discouraging to Grecian colonization .. .. 227
Some Epirotic tribes governed by kings, others not .. .. 228


## CHAPTER XXV.

### Illyrians, Macedonians, Pæonians.


Different tribes of Illyrians .. 230
Conflicts and contrasts of Illyrians with Greeks .. .. .. 233
Epidamnus and Apollonia in relation to the Illyrians .. .. 234
Early Macedonians .. .. .. 236
Their original seats .. .. .. 237
General view of the country which they occupied—eastward of Pindus and Skardus .. .. *ib.*
Distribution and tribes of the Macedonians .. .. .. 239
Macedonians round Edessa—the leading portion of the nation 240
Pierians and Bottiæans — originally placed on the Thermaic Gulf, between the Macedonians and the sea .. .. 240
Pæonians .. .. .. .. 242
Argeian Greeks who established the dynasty of Edessa—Perdikkas .. .. .. .. 243
Talents for command manifested by Greek chieftains over barbaric tribes .. .. .. 244
Aggrandizement of the dynasty of Edessa—conquests as far as the Thermaic Gulf, as well as over the interior Macedonians .. .. .. .. 245
Friendship between king Amyntas and the Peisistratids .. 246

## CHAPTER XXVI.

### THRACIANS AND GREEK COLONIES IN THRACE.


PAGE

Thracians—their numbers and abode .. .. .. .. 247
Many distinct tribes, yet little diversity of character .. .. *ib.*
Their cruelty, rapacity, and military efficiency .. .. .. 248
Thracian worship and character Asiatic .. .. .. .. 249
Early date of the Chalkidic colonies in Thrace .. .. .. *ib.*
Methônê the earliest—about 720 B.C. .. .. .. .. 250
Several other small settlements on the Chalkidic peninsula and its three projecting headlands *ib.*

PAGE

Chalkidic peninsula—Mount Athos 251
Colonies in Pallênê, or the westernmost of the three headlands *ib.*
In Sithonia or the middle headland *ib.*
In the headland of Athos—Akanthus, Stageira, &c. .. .. 252
Greek settlements east of the Strymôn in Thrace .. .. *ib.*
Island of Thasus .. .. .. 253
Thracian Chersonêsus .. .. 254
Perinthus, Selymbria, and Byzantium .. .. .. .. *ib.*
Grecian settlements on the Euxine, south of the Danube .. 255
Lêmnos and Imbros .. .. *ib.*


## CHAPTER XXVII.

### KYRÊNÊ AND BARKA.—HESPERIDES.


First voyages of the Greeks to Libya .. .. .. .. 256
Foundation of Kyrênê .. .. *ib.*
Founded by Battus from the island of Thêra .. .. .. 257
Colony first settled in the island of Platæa—afterwards removed to Kyrênê .. .. 258
Situation of Kyrênê .. .. 259
Fertility, produce, and prosperity .. .. .. .. .. 260
Libyan tribes near Kyrênê .. 261
Extensive dominion of Kyrênê and Barka over the Libyans 262
Connexion of the Greek colonies with the Nomads of Libya .. 263
Manners of the Libyan Nomads 265
Mixture of Greeks and Libyan inhabitants at Kyrênê .. *ib.*
Dynasty of Battus at Kyrênê—fresh colonists from Greece .. 266
Disputes with the native Libyans .. .. .. .. 267
Arkesilaus the Second, prince of Kyrênê—misfortunes of the city—foundation of Barka .. 268
Battus the third—a lame man—reform by Demônax .. .. 269
New immigration—restoration of the Battiad Arkesilaus the Third .. .. .. .. 271
Oracle limiting the duration of the Battiad dynasty .. .. *ib.*
Violences at Kyrênê under Arkesilaus the Third .. .. .. 272
Arkesilaus sends his submission to Kambysês king of Persia .. 273
Persian expedition from Egypt against Barka—Pheretimê mother of Arkesilaus .. .. *ib.*
Capture of Barka by perfidy—cruelty of Pheretimê .. .. 274
Battus the Fourth and Arkesilaus the Fourth—final extinction of the dynasty about 460—450 B.C. .. .. .. .. 275
Constitution of Demônax not durable .. .. .. .. *ib.*


## CHAPTER XXVIII.

### PAN-HELLENIC FESTIVALS—OLYMPIC, PYTHIAN, NEMEAN, AND ISTHMIAN.


Want of grouping and unity in the early period of Grecian history 276
New causes tending to favour union begin after 560 B.C.—no general war between 776 and 560 B.C. known to Thucydidês .. .. .. .. 277
Increasing disposition to religious, intellectual, and social union .. .. .. .. 278

## CHAPTER XXVIII.—*continued.*


| | PAGE |
|---|---|
| Reciprocal admission of cities to the religious festivals of each other | 279 |
| Early splendour of the Ionic festival at Dêlos—its decline | 280 |
| Olympic games—their celebrity and long continuance | 281 |
| Their gradual increase—new matches introduced | 282 |
| Olympic festival—the first which passes from a local to a Panhellenic character | 284 |
| Pythian games or festival | *ib.* |
| Early state and site of Delphi | *ib.* |
| Phokian town of Krissa | 285 |
| Kirrha, the sea-port of Krissa | 286 |
| Growth of Delphi and Kirrha—decline of Krissa | *ib.* |
| Insolence of the Kirrhæans punished by the Amphiktyons | 287 |
| First Sacred War, in 595 B.C. | 288 |
| Destruction of Kirrha.—Pythian games founded by the Amphiktyons | 289 |
| Nemean and Isthmian games | 290 |
| Pan-hellenic character acquired by all the four festivals—Olympic, Pythian, Nemean, and Isthmian | 292 |
| Increased frequentation of the other festivals in most Greek cities | *ib.* |
| All other Greek cities, except Sparta, encouraged such visits | 294 |
| Effect of these festivals upon the Greek mind | 295 |


## CHAPTER XXIX.

### LYRIC POETRY.—THE SEVEN WISE MEN.


| | |
|---|---|
| Age and duration of the Greek lyric poetry | 298 |
| Epical age preceding the lyrical | 299 |
| Wider range of subjects for poetry—new metres—enlarged musical scale | *ib.* |
| Improvement of the harp by Terpander—of the flute by Olympus and others | 300 |
| Archilochus, Kallinus, Tyrtæus, and Alkman—670—600 B.C. | 301 |
| New metres superadded to the Hexameter—Elegiac, Iambic, Trochaic | 303 |
| Archilochus | 304 |
| Simonidês of Amorgos, Kallinus, Tyrtæus | 305 |
| Musical and poetical tendencies at Sparta | 306 |
| Choric training—Alkman, Thalêtas | 309 |
| Doric dialect employed in the choric compositions | 310 |
| Arion and Stesichorus—substitution of the professional in place of the popular chorus | 311 |
| Distribution of the chorus by Stesichorus—Strophê,—Antistrophê,—Epôdus | 312 |
| Alkæus and Sappho | *ib.* |
| Gnomic or moralizing poets | 314 |
| Solôn and Theognis | *ib.* |
| Subordination of musical and orchestrical accompaniment to the words and meaning | 315 |
| Seven Wise Men | 316 |
| They were the first men who acquired an Hellenic reputation without poetical genius | 318 |
| Early manifestation of philosophy—in the form of maxims | *ib.* |
| Subsequent growth of dialectics and discussion | *ib.* |
| Increase of the habit of writing—commencement of prose compositions | 319 |
| First beginnings of Grecian art | 320 |
| Restricted character of early art from religious associations | 321 |
| Monumental ornaments in the cities—begin in the sixth century B.C. | 322 |
| Importance of Grecian art as a means of Hellenic union | *ib.* |


## CHAPTER XXX.

### GRECIAN AFFAIRS DURING THE GOVERNMENT OF PEISISTRATUS AND HIS SONS AT ATHENS.


| | |
|---|---|
| Peisistratus and his sons at Athens—B.C. 560—510—uncertain chronology as to Peisistratus | 324 |

## CHAPTER XXX.—*continued.*


| | PAGE |
|---|---|
| State of feeling in Attica at the accession of Peisistratus .. | 325 |
| Retirement of Peisistratus, and stratagem whereby he is reinstated .. .. .. .. | 326 |
| Quarrel of Peisistratus with the Alkmæônids—his second retirement .. .. .. .. | 328 |
| His second and final restoration | *ib.* |
| His strong government—mercenaries—purification of Dêlos | 329 |
| Mild despotism of Peisistratus .. | *ib.* |
| His sons Hippias and Hipparchus | 332 |
| Harmodius and Aristogeitôn .. | 333 |
| They conspire and kill Hipparchus, B.C. 514 .. .. .. | 334 |
| Strong and lasting sentiment, coupled with great historical mistake, in the Athenian public .. .. .. .. | 335 |
| Hippias despot alone—514—510 B.C.—his cruelty and conscious insecurity .. .. | 337 |
| Connexion of Athens with the Thracian Chersonêsus and the Asiatic coast of the Hellespont .. .. .. .. | 337 |
| First Miltiadês—œkist of the Chersonese .. .. .. | 338 |
| Second Miltiadês—sent out thither by the Peisistratids .. | 339 |
| Proceedings of the exiled Alkmæônidæ against Hippias .. | 340 |
| Conflagration and rebuilding of the Delphian temple .. .. | 341 |
| The Alkmæônidæ rebuild the temple with magnificence .. | *ib.* |
| Gratitude of the Delphians towards them—they procure from the oracle directions to Sparta, enjoining the expulsion of Hippias .. .. .. | 342 |
| Spartan expeditions into Attica .. .. .. .. | *ib.* |
| Expulsion of Hippias, and liberation of Athens .. .. .. | 343 |


## CHAPTER XXXI.

### GRECIAN AFFAIRS AFTER THE EXPULSION OF THE PEISISTRATIDS.—REVOLUTION OF KLEISTHENÊS AND ESTABLISHMENT OF DEMOCRACY AT ATHENS.


| | |
|---|---|
| State of Athens after the expulsion of Hippias .. .. .. | 346 |
| Opposing party-leaders—Kleisthenês—Isagoras .. .. | 347 |
| Democratical revolution headed by Kleisthenês .. .. .. | *ib.* |
| Re-arrangement and extension of the political franchise. Formation of ten new tribes, including an increased number of the population .. .. | 348 |
| Imperfect description of this event in Herodotus—its real bearing .. .. .. .. | *ib.* |
| Grounds of opposition to it in ancient Athenian feeling .. | 350 |
| Names of the tribes—their relation to the demes .. .. | 351 |
| Demes belonging to each tribe usually not adjacent to each other .. .. .. .. | 352 |
| Arrangements and functions of the deme .. .. .. .. | 353 |
| Solonian constitution preserved with modifications .. .. | 354 |
| Change of military arrangement in the state. The ten stratêgi or generals .. .. .. | 355 |
| The judicial assembly of citizens—or Heliæa—subsequently divided into bodies judging apart. The political assembly, or Ekklesia .. .. | 356 |
| Financial arrangements .. .. | *ib.* |
| Senate of Five Hundred .. .. | 357 |
| Ekklesia, or political assembly .. | 358 |
| Kleisthenês the real author of the Athenian democracy .. .. | 359 |
| Judicial attributes of the people—their gradual enlargement | *ib.* |
| Three points in Athenian constituti nal law, hanging together—Universal admissibility of citizens—Choice by lot—Reduced functions of the magistrates chosen by lot .. .. | 362 |
| Universal admissibility of citizens to the archonship—not introduced until after the battle of Platæa .. .. .. .. | 364 |
| Constitution of Kleisthenês retained the Solonian law of exclusion as to individual office | 365 |
| Difference between that constitution and the political state of Athens after Periklês .. | 366 |

## CHAPTER XXXI.—*continued.*


| | PAGE |
|---|---|
| Senate of Areopagus | 368 |
| The ostracism | 369 |
| Weakness of the public force in the Grecian governments | 370 |
| Past violences of the Athenian nobles | 371 |
| Necessity of creating a constitutional morality | 372 |
| Purpose and working of the ostracism | 373 |
| Securities against its abuse | 375 |
| Ostracism necessary as a protection to the early democracy—afterwards dispensed with | 376 |
| Ostracism analogous to the exclusion of a known pretender to the throne in a monarchy | 378 |
| Effect of the long ascendency of Periklês in strengthening constitutional morality | 379 |
| Ostracism in other Grecian cities | 380 |
| Striking effect of the revolution of Kleisthenês on the minds of the citizens | *ib.* |
| Isagoras calls in Kleomenês and the Lacedæmonians against it | 381 |
| Kleomenês and Isagoras expelled from Athens | 382 |
| Recall of Kleisthenês — Athens solicits the alliance of the Persians | 383 |
| First connexion between Athens and Platæa | *ib.* |
| Disputes between Platæa and Thêbes—Decision of Corinth | 384 |
| Second march of Kleomenês against Athens—desertion of his allies | 385 |
| First appearance of Sparta as acting head of Peloponnesian allies | 386 |
| Signal successes of Athens against Bœotians and Chalkidians | *ib.* |
| Plantation of Athenian settlers on Kleruchs in the territory of Chalkis | 387 |
| Distress of the Thebans—they ask assistance from Ægina | 388 |
| The Æginetans make war on Athens | 389 |
| Preparations at Sparta to attack Athens anew — the Spartan allies summoned together with Hippias | 390 |
| First formal convocation at Sparta —march of Greece towards a political system | 391 |
| Proceedings of the convocation—animated protest of Corinth against any interference in favour of Hippias—the Spartan allies refuse to interfere | 392 |
| Aversion to single-headed rule—now predominant in Greece | 393 |
| Striking development of Athenian energy after the revolution of Kleisthenês — language of Herodotus | 394 |
| Effect upon their minds of the idea or theory of democracy | *ib.* |
| Patriotism of an Athenian between 500—400 B.C. — combined with an eager spirit of personal military exertion and sacrifice | 396 |
| Diminution of this active sentiment in the restored democracy after the Thirty Tyrants | 397 |


## CHAPTER XXXII.

### Rise of the Persian Empire.—Cyrus.


| | |
|---|---|
| State of the Asiatic Greeks after the conquest of Lydia by Cyrus | 399 |
| Great power and alliances of Crœsus | 400 |
| Rise of Cyrus — uncertainty of his early history | *ib.* |
| Story of Astyagês | 401 |
| Herodotus and Ktêsias | 402 |
| Condition of the native Persians at the first rise of Cyrus | 403 |
| Territory of Iran—between Tigris and Indus | 404 |
| War between Cyrus and Crœsus | 405 |
| Crœsus tests the oracles—triumphant reply from Delphi—munificence of Crœsus to the oracle | 406 |
| Advice given to him by the oracle | 407 |
| He solicits the alliance of Sparta | *ib.* |
| He crosses the Halys and attacks the Persians | *ib.* |
| Rapid march of Cyrus to Sardis | 408 |
| Siege and capture of Sardis | *ib.* |
| Crœsus becomes prisoner of Cyrus —how treated | 409 |
| Remonstrance addressed by Crœsus to the Delphian god | 410 |

## CHAPTER XXXII.—*continued.*


PAGE

Successful justification of the oracle .. .. .. .. 411
Fate of Crœsus impressive to the Greek mind .. .. .. *ib.*
The Mœræ or Fates .. .. .. 412
State of the Asiatic Greeks after the conquest of Lydia by Cyrus 414
They apply in vain to Sparta for aid *ib.*
Cyrus quits Sardis—revolt of the Lydians suppressed .. .. 415
The Persian general Mazarês attacks Ionia—the Lydian Paktyas .. .. .. .. 416
Harpagus succeeds Mazarês—conquest of Ionia by the Persians .. .. .. .. 418
Fate of Phokæa .. .. .. *ib.*
Emigration of the Phokæans vowed by all, executed only by one-half .. .. .. 420
Phokæan colony first at Alalia, then at Elea .. .. .. 421
Proposition of Bias for a Panionic emigration not adopted 422
Entire conquest of Asia Minor by the Persians .. .. .. 423


## CHAPTER XXXIII.

### GROWTH OF THE PERSIAN EMPIRE.


Conquest of Cyrus in Asia .. 425
His attack of Babylon .. .. *ib.*
Difficult approach to Babylon—no resistance made to the invaders .. .. .. .. 427
Cyrus distributes the river Gyndes into many channels .. .. 428
He takes Babylon, by drawing off for a time the waters of the Euphratês .. .. .. 429
Babylon left in undiminished strength and population .. 430
Cyrus attacks the Massagetæ—is defeated and slain .. .. *ib.*
Extraordinary stimulus to the Persians, from the conquests of Cyrus .. .. .. .. 431
Character of the Persians .. 432
Thirst for foreign conquest among the Persians, for three reigns after Cyrus .. .. .. 433
Kambysês succeeds his father Cyrus—his invasion of Egypt 434
Death of Amasis, king of Egypt, at the time when the Persian expedition was preparing—his son Psammenitus succeeds .. 435
Conquest of Egypt by Kambysês *ib.*
Submission of Kyrênê and Barka to Kambysês—his projects for conquering Libya and Ethiopia disappointed .. .. *ib.*
Insults of Kambysês to the Egyptian religion .. .. .. 436
Madness of Kambysês—he puts to death his younger brother Smerdis .. .. .. .. *ib.*
Conspiracy of the Magian Patizeithês, who sets up his brother as king under the name of Smerdis .. .. .. 437
Death of Kambysês.. .. .. 438
Reign of the false Smerdis—conspiracy of the seven Persian noblemen against him—he is slain—Darius succeeds to the throne .. .. .. .. *ib.*
Political bearing of this conspiracy—Smerdis represents Median preponderance, which is again put down by Darius .. .. .. .. 440
Revolt of the Medes—suppressed. Discontents of the satraps .. 441
Revolt of Babylon .. .. .. 444
Reconquered and dismantled by Darius .. .. .. .. 446
Organization of the Persian empire by Darius .. .. .. 447
Twenty satrapies with a fixed tribute apportioned to each .. 449
Imposts upon the different satrapies .. .. .. .. 451
Organizing tendency of Darius—first imperial coinage—imperial roads and ports .. 452
Island of Samos—its condition at the accession of Darius. Polykratês .. .. .. .. 453
Polykratês breaks with Amasis king of Egypt and allies himself with Kambysês .. .. 455
The Samian exiles, expelled by Polykratês, apply to Sparta for aid .. .. .. .. 456
The Lacedæmonians attack Samos, but are repulsed .. *ib.*
Attack on Siphnos by the Samian exiles .. .. .. .. 457
Prosperity of Polykratês .. .. *ib.*
He is slain by the Persian satrap Orœtês .. .. .. .. 458

## CHAPTER XXXIII.—*continued.*

PAGE

Mæandrius, lieutenant of Polykratês in Samos—he desires to establish a free government after the death of Polykratês—conduct of the Samians .. 459
Mæandrius becomes despot. Contrast between the Athenians and the Samians .. .. 460
Sylosôn, brother of Polykratês, lands with a Persian army in Samos—his history .. .. 461
Mæandrius agrees to evacuate the island .. .. .. 462
Many Persian officers slain—slaughter of the Samians .. 463
Sylosôn despot at Samos .. .. 464
Application of Mæandrius to Sparta for aid—refused *ib.*

## CHAPTER XXXIV.

### DÊMOKÊDÊS.—DARIUS INVADES SCYTHIA.

Conquering dispositions of Darius 465
Influence of his wife Atossa .. *ib.*
Dêmokêdês—the Krotoniate surgeon—his adventures—he is carried as a slave to Susa .. 466
He cures Darius, who rewards him munificently .. .. 468
He procures permission, by artifice and through the influence of Atossa, to return to Greece .. 469
Atossa suggests to Darius an expedition against Greece—Dêmokêdês with some Persians is sent to procure information for him .. .. .. 470
Voyage of Dêmokêdês along the coast of Greece—he stays at Krotôn—fate of his Persian companions .. .. .. 471
Consequences which might have been expected to happen if Darius had then undertaken his expedition against Greece *ib.*
Darius marches against Scythia .. 474
His naval force formed of Asiatic and insular Greeks .. .. 475
He directs the Greeks to throw a bridge over the Danube and crosses the river .. .. 476
He marches into Scythia—narrative of his march impossible and unintelligible, considered as history .. .. .. 477
The description of his march is rather to be looked upon as a fancy picture, illustrative of Scythian warfare .. .. 478
Poetical grouping of the Scythians and their neighbours by Herodotus .. .. .. .. 479
Strong impression produced upon the imagination of Herodotus by the Scythians .. .. 480
Orders given by Darius to the Ionians at the bridge over the Danube .. .. .. .. 481
The Ionians left in guard of the bridge; their conduct when Darius's return is delayed .. 483
The Ionian despots preserve the bridge and enable Darius to re-cross the river, as a means of support to their own dominion at home .. .. 484
Opportunity of emancipation from the Persians—lost .. .. *ib.*
Conquest of Thrace by the Persians as far as the river Strymôn — Myrkinus, near that river, given to Histiæus .. 485
Macedonians and Pæonians conquered by Megabazus .. 487
Insolence and murder of the Persian envoys in Macedonia .. *ib.*
Histiæus founds a prosperous colony at Myrkinus—Darius sends for him into Asia .. 488
Otanês Persian general on the Hellespont—he conquers the Pelasgian population of Lêmnos, Imbros, &c. .. .. *ib.*
Lêmnos and Imbros captured by the Athenians and Miltiadês .. .. .. .. 489

## CHAPTER XXXV.

### IONIC REVOLT.

Darius carries Histiæus to Susa .. 492
Application of the banished Hippias to Artaphernês, satrap of Sardis .. .. 493

## CHAPTER XXXV.—*continued.*


PAGE

State of the island of Naxos—Naxian exiles solicit aid from Aristagoras of Milêtus .. *ib.*
Expedition against Naxos, undertaken by Aristagoras with the assistance of Artaphernês the satrap .. .. .. .. 494
Its failure, through dispute between Arjstagoras and the Persian general Megabatês .. 495
Alarm of Aristagoras—he determines to revolt against Persia—instigation to the same effect from Histiæus .. .. *ib.*
Revolt of Aristagoras and the Milesians—the despots in the various cities deposed and seized .. .. .. .. 496
Extension of the revolt throughout Asiatic Greece—Aristagoras goes to solicit aid from Sparta .. .. .. .. 497
Refusal of the Spartans to assist him .. .. .. .. 499
Aristagoras applies to Athens—obtains aid both from Athens and Eretria .. .. .. 500
March of Aristagoras up to Sardis with the Athenian and Eretrian allies—burning of the town—retreat and defeat of these Greeks by the Persians .. .. .. .. 501
The Athenians abandon the alliance .. .. .. .. 502
Extension of the revolt to Cyprus and Byzantium .. .. .. *ib.*
Phœnician fleet called forth by the Persians .. .. .. 503
Persian and Phœnician armament sent against Cyprus—the Ionians send aid thither—victory of the Persians—they reconquer the island .. .. 504
Successes of the Persians against the revolted coast of Asia Minor .. .. .. .. 505
Aristagoras loses courage and abandons the country .. 506
Appearance of Histiæus, who had obtained leave of departure from Susa .. .. .. 508
Histiæus suspected by Artaphernês—flees to Chios .. 509
He attempts in vain to procure admission into Milêtus—puts himself at the head of a small piratical squadron .. .. 510
Large Persian force assembled, aided by the Phœnician fleet, for the siege of Milêtus .. *ib.*
The allied Grecian fleet mustered at Ladê .. .. .. .. 511
Attempts of the Persians to disunite the allies by means of the exiled despots .. .. *ib.*
Want of command and discipline in the Grecian fleet .. .. 512
Energy of the Phokæan Dionysius—he is allowed to assume the command .. .. .. *ib.*
Discontent of the Grecian crews—they refuse to act under Dionysius .. .. .. 513
Contrast of this incapacity of the Ionic crews with the subsequent severe discipline of the Athenian seamen .. .. 514
Disorder and mistrust grow up in the fleet—treachery of the Samian captains .. .. *ib.*
Complete victory of the Persian fleet at Ladê—ruin of the Ionic fleet—severe loss of the Chians .. .. .. .. 515
Voluntary exile and adventures of Dionysius .. .. .. 516
Siege, capture, and ruin of Milêtus by the Persians .. .. *ib.*
The Phœnician fleet reconquers all the coast-towns and islands 518
Narrow escape of Miltiadês from their pursuit .. .. .. *ib.*
Cruelties of the Persians after the reconquest .. .. .. *ib.*
Movements and death of Histiæus 519
Sympathy and terror of the Athenians at the capture of Milêtus—the tragic writer Phrynichus is fined .. .. .. 520

# HISTORY OF GREECE.

## PART II.

### CONTINUATION OF HISTORICAL GREECE.

### CHAPTER XIII.

#### ASIATIC IONIANS.

THERE existed at the commencement of historical Greece in 776 B.C., besides the Ionians in Attica and the Cyclades, twelve Ionian cities of note on or near the coast of Asia Minor, besides a few others less important. Enumerated from south to north, they stand—Milêtus, Myûs, Priênê, Samos, Ephesus, Kolophôn, Lebedus, Teôs, Erythræ, Chios, Klazomenæ, Phôkæa.

Twelve Ionic cities in Asia.

That these cities, the great ornament of the Ionic name, were founded by emigrants from European Greece, there is no reason to doubt. How or when they were founded, we have no history to tell us: the legend which has already been set forth in a preceding chapter gives us a great event called the Ionic migration, referred by chronologists to one special year, 140 years after the Trojan war. This massive grouping belongs to the character of legend. The Æolic and Ionic emigrations, as well as the Dorian conquest of Poloponnêsus, are each invested with unity and imprinted upon the imagination as the results of a single great impulse.

Legendary event called the Ionic migration.

But such is not the character of the historical colonies: when we come to relate the Italian and Sicilian emigrations, it will appear that each colony has it own separate nativity and causes of existence. In the case of the Ionic emigration, this large scale of legendary conception is more than usually conspicuous, since to that event is ascribed the foundation or re-peopling both of the Cyclades and of the Asiatic Ionian cities.

Euripidês treats Iôn,[1] the son of Kreusa by Apollo, as the planter of these latter cities. But the more current form of the legend assigns that honour to the sons of Kodrus, two of whom are especially named, corresponding to the two greatest of the ten continental Ionic cities: Androklus as founder of Ephesus, Neileus of Milêtus. These two towns are both described as founded directly from Athens. The others seem rather to be separate settlements, neither consisting of Athenians, nor emanating from Athens, but adopting the characteristic Ionic festival of the Apaturia and (in part at least) the Ionic tribes—and receiving princes from the Kodrid families at Ephesus or Milêtus, as a condition of being admitted into the Pan-Ionic confederate festival. The poet Mimnermus ascribed the foundation of his native city Kolophôn to emigrants from Pylus in Peloponnêsus, under Andræmôn: Teôs was settled by Minyæ of Orchomenus, under Athamas: Klazomenæ by settlers from Kleônæ and Phlius, Phôkæa by Phokians, Priênê in large portion by Kadmeians from Thêbes. And with regard to the powerful islands of Chios and Samos, it does not appear that their native authors—the Chian poet Iôn or the Samian poet Asius—ascribed to them a population emanating from Athens. Nor could Pausanias make out from the poems of Iôn how it happened that Chios came to form a part of the Ionic federation.[2] Herodotus especially dwells upon the number of Grecian tribes and races who contributed to supply the population of the twelve Ionic cities—Minyæ from Orchomenus, Kadmeians, Dryopians, Phokians, Molossians, Arkadian Pelasgians, Dorians from Epi-

Emigrants to these cities—diverse Greeks.

1 Euripid. Iôn, 1546. *κτίστορ' Ἀσιάδος χθονός.*

2 Pausan. vii. 4, 6. *Τοσαῦτα εἰρηκότα ἐς Χίους Ἴωνα εὑρίσκω. οὐ μέντοι ἐκεῖνός γε εἴρηκε, καθ' ἥντινα αἰτίαν Χῖοι τελοῦσιν ἐς Ἰῶνας.*

Respecting Samos, and its primitive Karian inhabitants, displaced by Patroklês and Tembriôn at the head of Grecian emigrants, see Etymol. Mag v. *Ἀστυπάλαια.*

daurus, and "several other sections" of Greeks. Moreover he particularly singles out the Milesians, as claiming for themselves the truest Ionic blood, and as having started from the Prytaneium at Athens; thus plainly implying his belief that the majority at least of the remaining settlers did not take their departure from the same hearth.[1]

Great differences of dialect among the twelve cities.

But the most striking information which Herodotus conveys to us is, the difference of language or dialect which marked these twelve cities. Milêtus, Myûs, and Priênê, all situated on the soil of the Karians, had one dialect: Ephesus, Kolophôn, Lebedus, Teôs, Klazomenæ, and Phôkæa had a dialect common to all, but distinct from that of the three preceding: Chios and Erythræ exhibited a third dialect, and Samos by itself a fourth. The historian does not content himself with simply noting such quadruple variety of speech; he employs very strong terms to express the degree of dissimilarity.[2] The testimony of Herodotus as to these dialects is of course indisputable.

Ionic cities really founded by different migrations.

Instead of one great Ionic emigration, then, the statements above cited conduct us rather to the supposition of many separate and successive settlements, formed by Greeks of different sections, mingling with and modified by pre-existing Lydians and Karians, and subsequently allying themselves with Milêtus and Ephesus into the so-called Ionic Amphiktyony. As a condition of this union,

[1] Herodot. i. 146. ἐπεὶ, ὡς γέ τι μᾶλλον οὗτοι (*i.e.* the inhabitants of the Pan-Ionic Dodekapolis) Ἰωνές εἰσι τῶν ἄλλων Ἰώνων, ἢ καλλιόν τι γεγόνασι, μωρίη πολλὴ λέγειν· τῶν Ἀβαντες μὲν ἐξ Εὐβοίης εἰσὶν οὐκ ἐλαχίστη μοῖρα, τοῖσι Ἰωνίης μέτα οὐδὲ τοῦ οὐνόματος οὐδέν· Μίνυαι δὲ Ὀρχομένιοι ἀνεμεμίχαται, καὶ Καδμεῖοι, καὶ Δρύοπες, καὶ Φωκέες ἀποδάσμιοι, καὶ Μολοσσοὶ, καὶ Ἀρκάδες Πελασγοὶ, καὶ Δωριέες Ἐπιδαύριοι, ἄλλα τε ἔθνεα πολλὰ ἀναμεμίχαται. οἱ δὲ αὐτῶν, ἀπὸ τοῦ Πρυτανηίου τοῦ Ἀθηναίων ὁρμηθέντες, καὶ νομίζοντες γενναιότατοι εἶναι Ἰώνων, οὗτοι δὲ οὐ γυναῖκας ἠγάγοντο ἐς τὴν ἀποικίην, ἀλλὰ Καείρας ἔσχον, τῶν ἐφόνευσαν τοὺς γονέας. . . Ταῦτα δὲ ἦν γινόμενα ἐν Μιλήτῳ.

The polemical tone, in which this remark of Herodotus is delivered, is explained by Dahlmann on the supposition that it was destined to confute certain boastful pretensions of the Milesian Hekatæus (see Bähr, *ad loc.*, and Klausen ad Hekatæi Frag. 225).

The test of *Ionism*, according to the statement of Herodotus, is, that a city should derive its origin from Athens, and that it should celebrate the solemnity of the Apaturia (i. 147). But we must construe both these tests with indulgence. Ephesus and Kolophôn were Ionic, though neither of them celebrated the Apaturia. And the colony might be formed under the auspices of Athens, though the settlers were neither natives, nor even of kindred race with the natives, of Attica.

[2] Herod. i. 142. Ephesus, Kolophôn, Lebedus, Teôs, Klazomenæ, Phôkæa—αὗται αἱ πόλιες τῇσι πρότερον λεχθείσῃσι ὁμολογέουσι κατὰ γλῶσσαν οὐδέν, σφὶ δὲ ὁμοφωνέουσι.

they are induced to adopt among their chiefs princes of the Kodrid gens or family; who are called sons of Kodrus, but who are not for that reason to be supposed necessarily contemporary with Androklus or Neileus.

The chiefs selected by some of the cities are said to have been Lykians,[1] of the heroic family of Glaukus and Bellerophôn: there were other cities wherein the Kodrids and the Glaukids were chiefs conjointly. Respecting the dates of these separate settlements, we cannot give any account, for they lie beyond the commencement of authentic history. We see some ground for believing that most of them existed for some time previous to 776 B.C., but at what date the federative solemnity uniting the twelve cities was commenced, we do not know.

Consequences of the mixture of inhabitants in these colonies—more activity—more instability.

The account of Herodotus shows us that these colonies were composed of mixed sections of Greeks,—an important circumstance in estimating their character. Such was usually the case more or less in respect to all emigrations. Hence the establishments thus planted contracted at once, generally speaking, both more activity and more instability than was seen among those Greeks who remained at home, among whom the old habitual routine had not been counterworked by any marked change of place or of social relations. For in a new colony it became necessary to alter the classification of the citizens, to range them together in fresh military and civil divisions, and to adopt new characteristic sacrifices and religious ceremonies as bonds of union among all the citizens conjointly. At the first outset of a colony, moreover, there were inevitable difficulties to be surmounted which imposed upon its leading men the necessity of energy and forethought—more especially in regard to maritime affairs, on which not only their connexion with the countrymen whom they had left behind, but also their means of establishing advantageous relations with the population of the interior, depended. At the same time, the new arrangements indispensable among the colonists were far from working always harmoniously: dissension and partial secessions were not unfrequent occurrences. And what has been called the mobility

[1] Herodot. i. 146.

of the Ionic race, as compared with the Doric, is to be ascribed in a great measure to this mixture of races and external stimulus arising out of expatriation. For there is no trace of it in Attica anterior to Solôn; while on the other hand, the Doric colonies of Korkyra and Syracuse exhibit a population not less excitable than the Ionic towns generally,[1] and much more so than the Ionic colony of Massalia. The remarkable commercial enterprise, which will be seen to characterise Milêtus, Samos, and Phôkæa, belongs but little to anything connected with the Ionic temperament.

Mobility ascribed to the Ionic race as compared with the Doric—arises from this cause.

All the Ionic towns, except Klazomenæ and Phôkæa, are represented to have been founded on some pre-existing settlements of Karians, Lelegians, Kretans, Lydians, or Pelasgians.[2] In some cases these previous inhabitants were overcome, slain or expelled: in others they were accepted as fellow-residents, so that the Grecian cities, thus established, acquired a considerable tinge of Asiatic customs and feelings. What is related by Herodotus respecting the first establishment of Neileus and his emigrants at Milêtus is in this point of view remarkable. They took out with them no women from Athens (the historian says), but found wives in the Karian women of the place, whose husbands and fathers they overcame and put to death; and the women thus violently seized, manifested their repugnance by taking a solemn oath among themselves that they would never eat with their new husbands, nor ever call them by their personal names. This same pledge they imposed upon their daughters: but how long the practice lasted we are not informed. We may suspect from the language of the historian that traces of it were visible even in his day, in the family customs of the Milesians. The population of this greatest of the Ionic towns must thus have been half of Karian breed. It is to be presumed that what is true of Neileus and his companions would be found true also respecting most of the maritime colonies of Greece, and that the vessels which took them out would be scantily provided with women. But on this point unfortunately we are left without information.

Ionic cities in Asia—mixed with indigenous inhabitants.

[1] Thucyd. vi. 17, about the Sicilian Greeks—ὄχλοις τε γὰρ ξυμμιγτοῖς πολυανδροῦσιν αἱ πόλεις, καὶ ῥᾳδίας ἔχουσι τῶν πολιτειῶν τὰς μεταβολὰς καὶ ἐπιδοχάς.

[2] See Raoul Rochette, Histoire des Colonies Grecques, b. iv. c. 10, p. 93.

The worship of Apollo Didymeus, at Branchidæ, near Milêtus —that of Artemis, near Ephesus—and that of the Apollo Klarius, near Kolophôn—seems to have existed among the native Asiatic population before the establishment of either of these three cities. To maintain such pre-existing local rights was not less congenial to the feelings than beneficial to the interests of the Greeks. All the three establishments acquired increased celebrity under Ionic administration, contributing in their turn to the prosperity of the towns to which they were attached. Milêtus, Myûs, and Priênê were situated on or near the productive plain of the river Mæander; while Ephesus was in like manner planted near the mouth of the Kaïster, thus immediately communicating with the productive breadth of land separating Mount Tmôlus on the north from Mount Messôgis on the south, through which that river runs: Kolophôn is only a very few miles north of the same river. Possessing the best means of communication with the interior, these three towns seem to have thriven with greater rapidity than the rest; and they, together with the neighbouring island of Samos, constituted in early times the strength of the Pan-Ionic Amphiktyony. The situation of the sacred precinct of Poseidôn (where this festival was celebrated), on the north side of the promontory of Mykalê, near Priênê, and between Ephesus and Milêtus, seems to show that these towns formed the primitive centre to which the other Ionian settlements became gradually aggregated. For it was by no means a centrical site with reference to all the twelve; so that Thalês of Milêtus—who at a subsequent period recommended a more intimate political union between the twelve Ionic towns, and the establishment of a common government to manage their collective affairs—indicated Teôs,[1] and not Priênê, as the suitable place for it. Moreover it seems that the Pan-Ionic festival,[2]

Worship of Apollo and Artemis—existed on the Asiatic coast prior to the Greek immigrants—adopted by them.

Pan-Ionic festival and Amphiktyony on the promontory of Mykalê.

[1] Herodot. i. 170.

[2] Both Diodôrus (xv. 49) and Dionysius of Halikarnassus (A. R. iv. 25) speak as if the convocation or festival had been formally transferred to Ephesus, in consequence of the insecurity of the meetings near Mykalê; Strabo on the contrary speaks of the Pan-Ionia as if they were still in his time celebrated in the original spot (xiv. p. 636—638) under the care of the Priêneans. The formal transfer is not probable: Thucydidês (iii. 104) proves that in his time the festival of Ephesia was practically the Pan-Ionic rendezvous, though Herodotus does not seem to have con-

though still formally continued, had lost its importance before the time of Thucydidês, and had become practically superseded by the festival of the Ephesia, near Ephesus, where the cities of Ionia found a more attractive place of meeting.

Situation of Milêtus —of the other Ionic cities.

An island close adjoining to the coast, or an outlying tongue of land connected with the continent by a narrow isthmus, and presenting some hill sufficient for an acropolis, seem to have been considered the most favourable situations for Grecian colonial settlement. To one or other of these descriptions most of the Ionic cities conform.[1] The city of Milêtus at the height of its power had four separate harbours, formed probably by the aid of the island of Ladê and one or two islets which lay close off against it. The Karian or Kretan establishment, which the Ionic colonists found on their arrival and conquered, was situated on an eminence overhanging the sea, and became afterwards known by the name of Old Milêtus, at a time when the new Ionic town had been extended down to the waterside and rendered maritime.[2] The territory of this important city seems to have comprehended both the southern promontory called Poseidium and the greater part of the northern promontory of Mykalê,[3] reaching on both sides of the river Mæander. The inconsiderable town of Myûs[4] on the southern bank of the Mæander, an offset seemingly formed by the secession of some Milesian malcontents under a member of the Neleid gens named Kydrêlus, maintained for a long time its autonomy, but was at length absorbed into the larger unity of Milêtus; its swampy territory having been rendered uninhabitable by a plague of gnats. Priênê acquired an importance, greater than naturally belonged to it, by its immediate vicinity to the holy Pan-Ionic temple and its function of administering the sacred rites[5]—a dignity which it probably was only permitted to enjoy in consequence of the jealousies of its greater neighbours Milêtus, Ephesus, and Samos.[6] The

Territories inter-spersed with Asiatic villages.

ceived it as such. See Guhl, Ephesiaca, part iii. p. 117; and K. F. Hermann Gottesdienstliche Alterthümer der Griechen, c. 66, p. 343.

[1] The site of Milêtus is best indicated by Arrian, i. 19—20; see that of Phôkæa, Erythræ, Myonnêsus, Klazomenæ, Kolophôn, Teôs (Strabo, xiv. p. 644—645; Pausan. vii. 3, 2; Livy, xxxvii. 27—31; Thucyd. viii. 31).

[2] Strabo, xiv. p. 635.

[3] Strabo, xiv. p. 633; Herod. ix. 97—99. Τὸ Ποσειδιον τῶν Μιλησίων. Strabo, xiv. p. 651.

[4] Strabo, xiv. p. 636; Vitruvius, iv. 1; Polyæn. viii. 35.

[5] Strabo, xiv. p. 636—638.

[6] Thucyd. i. 116.

territories of these Grecian cities seem to have been interspersed with Karian villages, probably in the condition of subjects.

Magnêsia on the Mæander —Magnêsia on Mount Sipylus.

It is rare to find a genuine Greek colony established at any distance from the sea; but the two Asiatic towns called Magnêsia form exceptions to this position—one situated on the south side of the Mæander, or rather on the river Lethæus, which runs into the Mæander; the other more northerly, adjoining to the Æolic Greeks, on the northern declivity of Mount Sipylus, and near to the plain of the river Hermus. The settlement of both these towns dates before the period of history. The tale[1] which we read affirms them to be settlements from the Magnêtes in Thessaly, formed by emigrants who had first passed into Krête, under the orders of the Delphian oracle, and next into Asia, where they are said to have extricated the Ionic and Æolic colonists, then recently arrived, from a position of danger and calamity. By the side of this story, which can neither be verified nor contradicted, it is proper to mention the opinion of Niebuhr, that both these towns of Magnêsia are remnants of a primitive Pelasgic population, akin to, but not emigrants from, the Magnêtes of Thessaly—Pelasgians whom he supposes to have occupied both the valley of the Hermus and that of the Kaïster, anterior to the Æolic and Ionic migrations. In support of this opinion, it may be stated that there were towns bearing the Pelasgic name of Larissa, both near the Hermus and near the Mæander; Menekratês of Elæa considered the Pelasgians as having once occupied most part of that coast; and O. Müller even conceives the Tyrrhenians to have been Pelasgians from Tyrrha, a town in the interior of Lydia south of Tmôlus. The point is one upon which we have not sufficient evidence to advance beyond conjecture.[2]

[1] Conôn, Narrat. 29; Strabo, xiv. p. 636—647.

The story in Parthenius about Leukippus, leader τῶν δεκατευθέντων ἐκ Φέρης ὑπ' Ἀδμήτου, who came to the Ephesian territory and acquired possession of the place called Kretinæon by the treachery of Leukophryê, daughter of Mandrolytos, whether truth or romance, is one of the notices of Thessalian migration into those parts (Parthen. Narrat. 6).

[2] Strabo, xiii. p. 621. See Niebuhr, Kleine Historische Schriften, p. 371; O. Müller, Etrusker, Einleitung, ii. 5, p. 80. The evidence on which Müller's conjecture is built seems however unusually slender, and the identity of Tyrrhênos and Torrhêbos, or the supposed confusion of the one with the other, is in no way made out. Pelasgians are spoken of in Trallês and Aphrodisias as well as in Ninoê (Steph. Byz. v. Νινόη), but this name seems destined to present nothing but problems and delusions.

Of the Ionic towns, with which our real knowledge of Asia Minor begins, Milêtus[1] was the most powerful. Its celebrity was derived not merely from its own wealth and population, but also from the extraordinary number of its colonies, established principally in the Propontis and Euxine, and amounting, as we are told by some authors, to not less than 75 or 80. Respecting these colonies I shall speak presently, in treating of the general colonial expansion of Greece during the eighth and seventh centuries B.C.: at present it is sufficient to notice that the islands of Ikarus and Lerus,[2] not far from Samos and the Ionic coast generally, were among the places planted with Milesian settlers.

Ephesus—Androklus the Œkist—first settlement and distribution.

The colonization of Ephesus by Androklus appears to be connected with the Ionic occupation of Samos, so far as the confused statements which we find enable us to discern. Androklus is said to have lingered upon that island for a long time, until the oracle vouchsafed to indicate to him what particular spot to occupy on the continent. At length, the indication being given, he planted his colonists at the fountain of Hypelæon and on a portion of the hill of Korêssus, within a short distance of the temple and sanctuary of Artemis; whose immediate inhabitants he respected and received as brethren, while he drove away for the most part the surrounding Lelegians and Lydians. The population of the new town of Ephesus was divided into three tribes,—the pre-existing inhabitants, or Ephesians proper, the Bennians, and the Euônymeis, so named (we are told) from the deme Euônymus in Attica.[3] So much did the power of Androklus increase, that he was enabled to conquer Samos, and to expel from it the prince

Respecting Magnêsia on the Mæander, consult Aristot. ap. Athen. iv. p. 173, who calls the town a colony from Delphi. But the intermediate settlement of these colonists in Krête, or even the reality of any town called Magnêsia in Krête, appears very questionable: Plato's statement (Legg. iv. 702; xi. 919) can hardly be taken as any evidence. Compare O. Müller, History of the Dorians, book ii. ch. 3; Hoeck, Kreta, book iii. vol. ii. p. 413. Müller gives these "*Sagen*" too much in the style of real facts: the worship of Apollo at Magnêsia on the Mæander (Paus. x. 32, 4) cannot be thought to prove much, considering how extensively that god was worshipped along the Asiatic coast, from Lykia to Troas.

The great antiquity of this Grecian establishment was recognised in the time of the Roman emperors; see Inscript. No. 2910 in Boeckh, Corp. Inscript.

[1] Ἰωνίης πρόσχημα (Herodot. v. 28).

[2] Strabo, xiv. p. 635. Ikarus or Ikaria however appears in later times as belonging to Samos and used only for pasture (Strabo, p. 639; x. p. 488).

[3] Kreophylus ap. Athen. viii. p. 361; Ephor. Fragm. 32, ed. Marx; Stephan. Byz. v. Βέννα: see Guhl, Ephesiaca, p. 29.

Leôgorus. Of the retiring Samians, a part are said to have gone to Samothrace and to have there established themselves; while another portion acquired possession of Marathêsium near Ephesus, on the adjoining continent of Asia Minor, from whence, after a short time, they recovered their island, compelling Androklus to return to Ephesus. It seems, however, that in the compromise and treaty which ensued, they yielded possession of Marathêsium to Androklus,[1] and confined themselves to Anæa, a more southerly district farther removed from the Ephesian settlement, and immediately opposite to the island of Samos. Androklus is said to have perished in a battle fought for the defence of Priênê, which town he had come to aid against an attack of the Karians. His dead body was brought from the field and buried near the gates of Ephesus, where the tomb was yet shown during the days of Pausanias. But a sedition broke out against his sons after him, and the malcontents strengthened their party by inviting reinforcements from Teôs and Karina. The struggle which ensued terminated in the discontinuance of the kingly race and the establishment of a republican government—the descendants of Androklus being allowed to retain both considerable honorary privileges and the hereditary priesthood of the Eleusinian Dêmêtêr. The newly-received inhabitants were enrolled in two new tribes, making in all five tribes, which appear to have existed throughout the historical times at Ephesus.[2] It appears too that a certain number of fugitive proprietors from Samos found admission among the Ephesians and received the freedom of the city; and the part of the city in which they resided acquired the name of Samorna or Smyrna, by which name it was still known in the time of the satirical poet Hippônax, about 530 B.C.[3]

Such are the stories which we find respecting the infancy of the Ionic Ephesus. The fact of its increase and of its considerable acquisitions of territory, at the expense of the neighbouring Lydians,[4] is at least indisputable. It does not appear to have

[1] Pausan. vii. 4, 3.

[2] The account of Ephorus ap. Steph. Byz. v. Βένα, attests at least the existence of the five tribes at Ephesus, whether his account of their origin and primitive history be well-founded or not. See also Strabo, xiv. p. 633; Steph. Byz. v. Εὐωνυμία. Karênê or Karinê is in Æolis, near Pitanê and Gryneium (Herod. vii. 42: Steph. Byz. Καρήνη).

[3] Stephen. Byz. v. Σάμορνα; Hesych. Σαμονία; Athenæus, vi. p. 267; Hippônax, Fragm. 32, Schneid.; Strabo, xiv. p. 633. Some however said that the *vicus* of Ephesus, called Smyrna, derived its name from an Amazon.

[4] Strabo, xiv. p. 620.

been ever very powerful or enterprising at sea. Few maritime colonies owed their origin to its citizens. But its situation near the mouth and the fertile plain of the Kaïster was favourable both to the multiplication of its inland dependencies and to its trade with the interior. A despot named Pythagoras is said to have subverted by stratagem the previous government of the town, at some period before Cyrus, and to have exercised power for a certain time with great cruelty.[1] It is worthy of remark, that we find no trace of the existence of the four Ionic tribes at Ephesus; and this, when coupled with the fact that neither Ephesus nor Kolophôn solemnised the peculiar Ionic festival of the Apaturia, is one among other indications that the Ephesian population had little community of race with Athens, though the Œkist may have been of heroic Athenian family. Guhl attempts to show, on mistaken grounds, that the Greek settlers at Ephesus were mostly of Arkadian origin.[2]

Increase and acquisitions of Ephesus.

Kolophôn—about fifteen miles north of Ephesus, and divided from the territory of the latter by the precipitous mountain range called Gallêsium—though a member of the Pan-Ionic Amphiktyony, seems to have had no Ionic origin. It recognised neither an Athenian Œkist nor Athenian inhabitants. The Kolophonian poet Mimnermus tells us that the Œkist of the place was the Pylian Andræmôn, and that the settlers were Pylians from Peloponnêsus. "We quitted (he says) Pylus, the city of Nêleus, and passed in our vessels to the much-desired Asia. There, with the insolence of superior force, and employing from the beginning cruel violence, we planted ourselves in the tempting Kolophôn."[3] This description

Kolophôn, its origin and history.

[1] Bato ap. Suidas, v. Πυθαγόρας. In this article of Suidas, however, it is stated that "the Ephesian Pythagoras put down by means of a crafty plot the government of those who were called the *Basilidæ*". Now Aristotle talks (Polit. v. 5, 4) of the oligarchy of the Basilidæ at Erythræ. It is hardly likely that there should have been an oligarchy called by that same name both at Erythræ and Ephesus: there is here some confusion between Erythræ and Ephesus which we are unable to clear up. Bato of Sinôpê wrote a book περὶ τῶν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ τυμάνων (Athen. vii. p. 289).

[2] Guhl, Ephesiaca, cap. ii. s. 2, p. 28. The passage which he cites in Aristeidês (Or. xlii. p. 523) refers not to Ephesus, but to Pergamus, and to the mythe of Augê and Têlephus: compare *ibid.* p. 251.

[3] Mimnerm. Fragm. 9, Schneid. ap. Strab. xiv. p. 634:—

Ἡμεῖς δ' αἰπὺ Πύλον Νηλήϊον ἄστυ λιπόντες
Ἰμερτὴν Ἀσίην ηυσὶν ἀφικόμεθα·
Ἐς δ' ἐρατὴν Κολοφῶνα, βίην ὑπέροπλον ἔχοντες,
Ἐζόμεθ' ἀργαλέης ὕβριος ἡγεμόνες.

of the primitive Kolophonian settlers, given with Homeric simplicity, forcibly illustrates the account given by Herodotus of the proceedings of Neileus at Milêtus. The establishment of Andræmôn must have been effected by force, and by the dispossession of previous inhabitants, leaving probably their wives and daughters as a prey to the victors. The city of Kolophôn seems to have been situated about two miles inland; having a fortified port called Notium, not joined to it by long walls as the Peiræeus was to Athens, but completely distinct. There were times in which this port served the Kolophonians as a refuge, when their upper town was assailed by Persians from the interior. But the inhabitants of Notium occasionally manifested inclinations to act as a separate community, and dissensions thus occurred between them and the people in Kolophôn[1]—so difficult was it in the Greek mind to keep up a permanent feeling of political amalgamation beyond the circle of the town walls.

It is much to be regretted that nothing beyond a few lines of Mimnermus, and nothing at all of the long poem of Xenophanês (composed seemingly nearly a century after Mimnermus) on the foundation of Kolophôn, has reached us. The statements of Pausanias omit all notice of that violence which the native Kolophonian poet so emphatically signalizes in his ancestors.

Temple of Apollo at Klarus, near Kolophôn—its legends.

They are derived more from the temple legends of the adjoining Klarian Apollo, and from morsels of epic poetry referring to that holy place, which connected itself with the worship of Apollo in Krête, at Delphi, and at Thêbes. The old Homeric poem, called Thebaïs, reported that Mantô, daughter of the Theban prophet Teiresias, had been presented to Apollo and Delphi, as a votive offering by the victorious Epigoni: the god directed her to migrate to Asia, and she thus arrived at Klarus, where she married the Kretan Rhakius. The offspring of this marriage

Mimnermus, in his poem called *Nanno*, named Andræmôn as founder (Strabo, p. 633). Compare this behaviour with the narrative of Odysseus in Homer (Odyss. ix. 40):—

Ἰλιόθεν με φέρων ἄνεμος Κικόνεσσι πέλασσεν
Ἰσμάρῳ· ἔνθα δ' ἐγὼ πόλιν ἔπραθον, ὦλεσα δ' αὐτούς·
Ἐκ πόλιος δ' ἀλόχους καὶ κτήματα πολλὰ λαβόντες
Δάσσαμεθ', &c.

Mimnermus comes in point of time a little before Solôn, B.C. 620—600.

[1] Aristot. Polit. v. 2, 12; Thucyd. iii. 34.

was the celebrated prophet Mopsus, whom the Hesiodic epic described as having gained a victory in prophetic skill over Kalchas; the latter having come to Klarus after the Trojan war in company with Amphilochus son of Amphiaraus.[1] Such tales evince the early importance of the temple and oracle of Apollo at Klarus, which appears to have been in some sort an emanation from the great sanctuary of Branchidæ near Milêtus; for we are told that the high priest of Klarus was named by the Milesians.[2] Pausanias states that Mopsus expelled the indigenous Karians, and established the city of Kolophôn; and the Ionic settlers under Promêthus and Damasichthôn, sons of Kodrus, were admitted amicably as additional inhabitants:[3] a story probably emanating from that of the Kolophonian townsmen in the time of Mimnermus. It seems evident that not only the Apollinic sanctuary at Klarus, but also the analogous establishments on the south of Asia Minor at Phasêlis, Mallus, &c., had their own foundation legends (apart from those of the various bands of emigrant settlers), in which they connected themselves by the best thread which they could devise with the epic glories of Greece.[4]

Lebedus, Teôs, Klazomenæ, &c.

Passing along the Ionian coast in a north-westerly direction from Kolophôn, we come first to the small but independent Ionic settlement of Lebedus—next, to Teôs, which occupies the southern face of a narrow isthmus, Klazomenæ being placed on the northern. This isthmus, a low narrow valley of about six miles across, forms the eastern boundary of a very considerable peninsula, containing the mountainous and woody regions called Mimas and Kôrykus. Teôs is said to have been first founded by Orchomenian Minyæ under Athamas, and to have received afterwards by consent various swarms of settlers, Orchomenians and others, under the Kodrid leaders Apœkus, Nauklus, and Damasus.[5] The valuable Teian inscriptions published in the large collection of Boeckh, while they mention certain names and titles of honour which

[1] Hesiod. ap. Strab. xiv. p. 643; Conôn, Narrat. 6; Argument of the poem called Νόστοι (apud Düntzer), Epic. Græc. Frag. p. 23; Pausan. ix. 33, 1.

[2] Tacit. Annal. ii. 54.

[3] Pausan. vii. 3, 1.

[4] See Welcker, Epischer Cyklus, p. 285.

[5] Steph. Byz. v. Τέως; Pausan. vii. 3, 3; Strabo, xiv. p. 633. Anakreôn called the town Ἀθαμαντίδα Τέω (Strab. *l. c.*).

connect themselves with this Orchomenian origin, reveal to us some particulars respecting the internal distribution of the Teian citizens. The territory of the town was distributed amongst a certain number of towers, to each of which corresponded a symmory or section of the citizens, having its common altar and sacred rites, and often its heroic Eponymus. How many in number the tribes of Teôs were, we do not know. The name of the Geleontes, one of the four old Ionic tribes, is preserved in an inscription: but the rest, both as to names and number, are unknown. The symmories or tower-fellowships of Teôs seem to be analogous to the phratries of ancient Athens—forming each a factitious kindred, recognising a common mythical ancestor, and bound together by a communion at once religious and political. The individual name attached to each tower is in some cases Asiatic rather than Hellenic, indicating in Teôs the mixture not merely of Ionic and Æolic, but also of Karian or Lydian inhabitants, of which Pausanias speaks.[1]

Internal distribution of the inhabitants of Teôs.

[1] Pausan. vii. 3, 3. See the Inscrip. No. 3064 in Boeckh's Corp. Ins., which enumerates twenty-eight separate πύργοι. It is a list of archons, with the name and civil designation of each: I do not observe that the name of the same πύργος ever occurs twice—'Αρτέμων, τοῦ Φιλαίου πύργου, Φιλαΐδης, &c.: there are two πύργοι, the names of which are effaced on the inscription. In two other inscriptions (Nos. 3065, 3066) there occur 'Εχίνου συμμορία—'Εχίναδαι—as the title of a civil division without any specification of an 'Εχίνου πύργος; but it is reasonable to presume that the πύργος and the συμμορία are coincident divisions. The Φιλαίου πύργος occurs also in another Inscr. No. 3081. Philæus is the Athenian hero, son of Ajax, and eponym of the deme or gens Philaidæ in Attica, who existed, as we here see, in Teôs also. In Inscription, No. 3082, a citizen is complimented as νέον 'Αθάμαντα, after the name of the old Minyan hero. In No. 3078, the Ionic tribe of the Γελέοντες is named as existing at Teôs.

Among the titles of the towers we find the following—τοῦ Κίδυος πύργου, τοῦ Κιναβάλου πύργου, τοῦ 'Ιέρυος πύργου, τοῦ Δάδδου πύργου, τοῦ Σίντυος πύργου: these names seem to be rather foreign than Hellenic. Κίδυς, 'Ιέρυς, Σίντυς, Δάδδος, are Asiatic, perhaps Karian or Lydian: respecting the name Δάδδος, compare Steph. Byz. v. Τρέμισσος, where Δάδας appears as a Karian name: Boeckh (p. 651) expresses his opinion that Δάδδος is Karian or Lydian. Then Κινάβαλος seems plainly not Hellenic: it is rather Phœnician (Annibal, Asdrubal, &c.), though Boeckh (in his Introductory Comment to the Sarmatian Inscriptions, Part xi. p. 109) tells us that βαλος is also Thracian or Getic—"βαλος haud dubie Thracica aut Getica est radix finalis, quam tenes in Dacico nomine Decebalus, et in nomine populi Triballorum". The name τοῦ Κόθου πύργου, Κοθίδης, is Ionic: Æklus and Kothus are represented as Ionic cekists in Eubœa. Another name—Πάρμις, τοῦ Σθενέλου πύργου, Χαλκιδεῖος—affords an instance in which the local or gentile epithet is not derived from the tower; for Χαλκιδεῖς or Χαλκιδεύς was the denomination of a village in the Teian territory. In regard to some persons, the gentile epithet is derived from the tower—τοῦ Φιλαίου πύργου, Φιλαΐδης—τοῦ Γαλαίσου πύργου, Γαλαισίδης—τοῦ Δάδδου πύργου, Δαδδεῖος—τοῦ πύργου τοῦ Κιζῶνος, Κιζῶν: in other cases not—τοῦ 'Εκαδίου πύργου, Σκηβηΐδης — τοῦ Μηράδους πύργου, Βρυσκίδης—τοῦ 'Ισθμίου πύργου, Λεωνίδης, &c. In the Inscr. 3065, 3066, there is a formal vote of the 'Εχίνου συμμορία or 'Εχίναδαι (both names occur). Mention is also made of the

Gerrhæidæ or Cherræidæ, the port on the west side of the town of Teôs, had for its eponymous hero Gerês the Bœotian, who was said to have accompanied the Kodrids in their settlement.

The worship of Athênê Polias at Erythræ may probably be traceable to Athens, and that of the Tyrian Hêraklês (of which Pausanias recounts a singular legend) would seem to indicate an intermixture of Phœnician inhabitants. But the close neighbourhood of Erythræ to the island of Chios, and the marked analogy of dialect which Herodotus[1] attests between them, show that the elements of the population must have been much the same in both. The Chian poet Iôn mentioned the establishment of Abantes from Eubœa in his native island, under Amphiklus, intermixed with the pre-existing Karians. Hektôr, the fourth descendant from Amphiklus, was said to have incorporated this island in the Pan-Ionic Amphiktyony. It is to Pherekydês that we owe the mention of the name of Egertius, as having conducted a miscellaneous colony into Chios; and it is through Egertius (though Iôn, the native poet, does not appear to have noticed him) that this logographer made out the connexion between the Chians and the other group of Kodrid settlements.[2] In Erythræ, Knôpus, or Kleopus, is noted as the Kodrid Œkist, and as having procured for himself, partly by force, partly by consent, the sovereignty of the pre-existing settlement of mixed inhabitants. The Erythræan historian Hippias recounted how Knôpus had been treacherously put to death on shipboard by Ortygês and some other false adherents; who, obtaining some auxiliaries from the Chian king Amphiklus, made themselves masters of Erythræ and established in it an oppressive oligarchy. They maintained the government, with a temper at once licentious and cruel, for some time, admitting none but a chosen few of the population within the walls of the town; until at length Hippotês the brother of Knôpus, arriving from without at the head of some troops, found sufficient support

Erythræ and Chios.

βῶμος τῆς συμμορίας, and of the annual solemnity called Leukathea, seemingly a gentile solemnity of the Echinadæ, which connects itself with the mythical family of Athamas. As an analogy to these Teian towers, we may compare the πύργοι in the Greek settlement of Olbia in the Euxine (Boeckh, Insc. 2058), πύργος Πόσιος, πύργος Ἐπιδαύρου —they were portions of the fortifications. See also Dio Chrysostom, Orat. xxxvi. p. 76—77. A large tower, belonging to a private individual named Aglomachus, is mentioned in Kyrênê (Herod. iv. 164).

[1] Herod. i. 142: compare Thucyd. viii. 5.

[2] Strabo. xiv. p. 633.

from the discontents of the Erythræans to enable him to overthrow the tyranny. Overpowered in the midst of a public festival, Ortygês and his companions were put to death with cruel tortures. The like tortures were inflicted upon their innocent wives and children[1]—a degree of cruelty which would at no time have found place amidst a community of European Greeks: even in the murderous party dissensions of Korkyra during the Peloponnesian war, death was not aggravated by preliminary tortures. Aristotle[2] mentions the oligarchy of the Basilids as having existed in Erythræ, and as having been overthrown by a democratical revolution, although prudently managed. To what period this is to be referred we do not know.

Klazomenæ —Phôkæa.

Klazomenæ is said to have been founded by a wandering party, either of Ionians or of inhabitants from Kleônæ and Phlius, under Parphorus or Paralus; and Phôkæa by a band of Phokians under Philogonês and Damôn. This last-mentioned town was built at the end of a peninsula which formed part of the territory of the Æolic Kymê: the Kymæans were induced to cede it amicably, and to permit the building of the new town. The Phokians asked and obtained permission to enrol themselves in the Pan-Ionic Amphiktyony; but the permission is said to have been granted only on condition that they should adopt members of the Kodrid family as their Œkists: and they accordingly invited from Erythræ and Teôs three chiefs belonging to that family or gens—Deœtês, Periklus, and Abartus.[3]

Smyrna.

Symrna, originally an Æolic colony, established from Kymê, fell subsequently into the hands of the Ionians of Kolophôn. A party of exiles from the latter city, expelled during an intestine dispute, were admitted by the Smyrnæans into their city—a favour which they repaid by shutting the gates and seizing the place for themselves, at a moment when the Smyrnæans had gone forth in a body to

[1] Hippias ap. Athen. vi. p. 259; Polyæn. viii. 44, gives another story about Knôpus. Erythræ, called Κνωπούπολις (Steph. Byz. v.).

The story told by Polyænus about the dictum of the oracle, and the consequent stratagem whereby Knôpus made himself master of Erythræ, represents that town as powerful anterior to the Ionic occupation (Polyæn. viii. 43).

[2] Aristot. Polit. v. 5, 4.

[3] Pausan. vii. 3, 3. In Pausanias the name stands *Abartus*; but it probably ought to be *Abarnus*, the Eponymus of Cape Abarnis in the Phôkæan territory: see Stephan. Byz. v. Ἄβαρνίς. Raoul Rochette puts Abarnus without making any remark (Histoire des Colonies Grecques, b. iv. c. 13, p. 95).

celebrate a religious festival. The other Æolic towns sent auxiliaries for the purpose of re-establishing their dispossessed brethren: but they were compelled to submit to an accommodation whereby the Ionians retained possession of the town, restoring to the prior inhabitants all their moveables. These exiles were distributed as citizens among the other Æolic cities.[1]

Smyrna after this became wholly Ionian; and the inhabitants in later times, if we may judge by Aristeidês the rhetor, appear to have forgotten the Æolic origin of their town, though the fact is attested by Herodotus and by Mimnermus.[2] At what time the change took place we do not know, but Smyrna appears to have become Ionian before the celebration of the twenty-third Olympiad (B.C. 668), when Onomastus the Smyrnæan gained the prize.[3] Nor have we information as to the period at which the city was received as a member into the Pan-Ionic Amphiktyony; for the assertion of Vitruvius is obviously inadmissible, that it was admitted at the instance of Attalus king of Pergamus, in place of a previous town called Melitê, excluded by the rest for misbehaviour.[4] As little can we credit the statement of Strabo, that the city of Smyrna was destroyed by the Lydian kings, and that the inhabitants were compelled to live in dispersed villages until its restoration by Antigonus. A fragment of Pindar, which speaks of "the elegant city of the Smyrnæans," indicates that it must have existed in his time.[5] The town of Eræ, near Lebedus, though seemingly autonomous,[6] was not among the contributors to the Pan-Ionion; Myonnêsus seems to have been a dependency of Teôs, as Pygela and Marathêsium were of Ephesus. Notium, after its re-colonization by the Athenians during the Peloponnesian war, seems to have remained separate from and independent of Kolophôn: at least the two are noticed by Skylax as distinct towns.[7]

[1] Herod. i 150; Mimnermus, Fragm.—

Θεῶν βουλῇ Σμύρνην εἵλομεν Αἰολίδα.

[2] See Raoul Rochette, Histoire des Colonies Grecques, b. iv. ch. 5, p. 43; Aristeidês, Orat. xx.—xxi. pp. 260, 267.

[3] Pausan. v. 8, 3.

[4] Vitruvius, iv. 1.

[5] Strabo, xiv. p. 646; Pindar, Frag. 155, Dissen.

[6] Thucyd. viii. 19.

[7] Skylax, c. 97; Thucyd. iii. 34.

# CHAPTER XIV.

## ÆOLIC GREEKS IN ASIA.

Twelve cities of Æolic Greeks.

ON the coast of Asia Minor to the north of the twelve Ionic confederated cities, were situated the twelve Æolic cities, apparently united in a similar manner. Besides Smyrna, the fate of which has already been described, the eleven others were—Têmnos, Larissa, Neon-Teichos, Kymê, Ægæ, Myrina, Gryneium, Killa, Notium, Ægiroëssa, Pitanê. These twelve are especially noted by Herodotus, as the twelve ancient continental Æolic cities, and distinguished on the one hand from the insular Æolic Greeks, in Lesbos, Tenedos, and Hekatonnêsoi—and on the other hand from the Æolic establishments in and about Mount Ida, which seem to have been subsequently formed and derived from Lesbos and Kymê.[1]

Their situation—eleven near together on the Elæitic Gulf.

Of these twelve Æolic towns, eleven were situated very near together, clustered round the Elæitic Gulf: their territories, all of moderate extent, seem also to have been conterminous with each other. Smyrna, the twelfth, was situated to the south of Mount Sipylus, and at greater distance from the remainder—one reason why it was so soon lost to its primitive inhabitants. These towns occupied chiefly a narrow but fertile strip of territory lying between the base of the woody mountain-range called Sardênê and the sea.[2] Gryneium, like Kolophôn and Milêtus, possessed a venerated sanctuary of Apollo, of older date than the Æolic immigration. Larissa, Têmnos, and Ægæ were at some little distance from the sea; the first at a short distance north of

[1] Herodot. i. 149. Herodotus does not name Elæa, at the mouth of the Kaikus: on the other hand, no other author mentions Ægiroëssa (see Mannert, Geogr. der Gr. und Römer, b. viii. p. 396).

[2] Herod. *ut sup.*; Pseudo-Herodot. Vit. Homeri, c. 9. Σαρδήνης πόδα νείατον ὑψικόμοιο.

the Hermus, by which its territory was watered and occasionally inundated, so as to render embankments necessary ;[1] the last two upon rocky mountain-sites, so inaccessible to attack, that the inhabitants were enabled, even during the height of the Persian power, to maintain constantly a substantial independence.[2] Elæa, situated at the mouth of the river Kaïkus, became in later times the port of the strong and flourishing city of Pergamus ; while Pitanê, the northernmost of the twelve, was placed between the mouth of the Kaïkus and the lofty promontory of Kanê, which closes in the Elæitic Gulf to the northward. A small town Kanæ close to that promontory is said to have once existed.[3]

Legendary Æolic migration.

It has already been stated that the legend ascribes the origin of these colonies to a certain special event called the Æolic emigration, of which chronologers profess to know the precise date, telling us how many years it happened after the Trojan war, considerably before the Ionic emigration.[4] That the Æolic as well as the Ionic inhabitants of Asia were emigrants from Greece, we may reasonably believe, but as to the time or circumstances of their emigration we can pretend to no certain knowledge. The name of the town Larissa, and perhaps that of Magnêsia on Mount Sipylus (according to what has been observed in the preceding chapter), has given rise to the supposition that the anterior inhabitants were Pelasgians, who, having once occupied the fertile banks of the Hermus, as well as

[1] Strabo, xiii. p. 621.

[2] Xenoph. Hellen. iv. 8, 5. The rhetor Aristeidês (Orat. Sacr. xxvii. p. 347, p. 535 D.) describes in detail his journey from Smyrna to Pergamus, crossing the Hermus, and passing through Larissa, Kymê, Myrina, Gryneium, Elæa. He seems not to have passed through Têmnos, at least he does not name it: moreover we know from Pausanias (v. 13, 3) that Têmnos was on the north bank of the Hermus. / In the best maps of this district it is placed, erroneously, both on the south bank, and as if it were on the high road from Smyrna to Kymê. We may infer from another passage of Aristeidês (Or. xlviii. p. 351, p. 468 D.) that Larissa was nearer to the mouth of the Hermus than the maps appear to place it. According to Strabo (xiii. p. 622), it would seem that Larissa was on the south bank of the Hermus; but the better testimony of Aristeidês proves the contrary; Skylax (c. 94) does not name Têmnos, which seems to indicate that its territory was at some distance from the sea.

The investigations of modern travellers have as yet thrown little light upon the situation of Têmnos or of the other Æolic towns: see Arundel, Discoveries in Asia Minor, vol. ii. pp. 292—298.

[3] Pliny, H. N. v. 30.

[4] Strabo, xiii. pp. 582—621, compared with Pseudo-Herodotus, Vit. Homer. c. 1—38, who says that Lesbos was occupied by the Æolians 130 years after the Trojan war; Kymê, 20 years after Lesbos; Smyrna, 18 years after Kymê.

The chronological statements of different writers are collected in Mr. Clinton's Fast. Hellen. c. 5, pp. 104, 105.

those of the Kaïster near Ephesus, employed their industry in the work of embankment.[1] Kymê was the earliest as well as the most powerful of the twelve Æolic towns; Neon-Teichos having been originally established by the Kymæans as a fortress for the purpose of capturing the Pelasgic Larissa. Both Kymê and Larissa were designated by the epithet of Phrikônis. By some this was traced to the mountain Phrikium in Lokris; from whence it was alleged that the Æolic emigrants had started to cross the Ægean: by others it seems to have been connected with an eponymous hero Phrikôn.[2]

Kymê—the earliest as well as the most powerful of the twelve.

It was probably from Kymê and its sister cities on the Elæitic Gulf that Hellenic inhabitants penetrated into the smaller towns in the inland plain of the Kaïkus—Pergamus, Halisarna, Gambreion, &c.[3] In the more southerly plain of the Hermus, on the northern declivity of Mount Sipylus, was situated the city of Magnêsia, called Magnêsia *ad Sipylum* in order to distinguish it from Magnêsia on the river Mæander. Both these towns called Magnêsia were inland—the one bordering upon the Ionic Greeks, the other upon the Æolic, but seemingly not included in any[4] Amphiktyony either with the one or the other. Each is referred to a separate and early immigration either from the Magnêtes in Thessaly or from Krête. Like many other of the early towns, Magnêsia ad Sipylum appears to have been originally established higher up on the mountain—in a situation nearer to Smyrna, from which it was separated by the Sipylene range—and to have been subsequently brought down nearer to the plain on the north side as well as to the river Hermus. The original site, Palæ-Magnêsia,[4] was still occupied as a dependent township, even during the times of the Attalid and Seleukid kings. A like transfer of situation, from a

Magnêsia ad Sipylum.

[1] Strabo, xiii. p. 621

[2] Strabo, xiii. 621; Pseudo-Herodot. c. 14, Δαοὶ Φρίκωνος, compared with c. 38.

Φρίκων appears in later times as an Ætolian proper name; Φρίκος as a Lokrian. See Anecdota Delphica by E. Curtius, Inscript. 40, p. 75 (Berlin, 1843).

[3] Xenoph. Hellen. iii. 1, 6; Anabas. vii. 8, 24.

[4] There is a valuable inscription in Boeckh's collection, No. 3137, containing the convention between the inhabitants of Smyrna and Magnêsia. Palæ-Magnêsia seems to have been a strong and important post.

"Magnêtes a Sipylo," Tacit. Annal. ii. 47; Pliny, H. N. v. 29: Pausan. iii. 24, 2. πρὸς βόρραν τοῦ Σιπύλου.

Stephan. Byzantinus notices only Magnêsia ad Mæandrum, not Magnêsia ad Sipylum.

height difficult of access to some lower and more convenient position, took place with other towns in and near this region; such as Gambreion and Skêpsis, which had their Palæ-Gambreion and Palæ-Skêpsis not far distant.

Of these twelve Æolic towns, it appears that all except Kymê were small and unimportant. Thucydidês, in recapitulating the dependent allies of Athens at the commencement of the Peloponnesian war, does not account them worthy of being enumerated.[1] Nor are we authorised to conclude, because they bear the general name of Æolians, that the inhabitants were all of kindred race, though a large proportion of them are said to have been Bœotians, and the feeling of fraternity between Bœotians and Lesbians was maintained throughout the historical times. One etymology of the name is indeed founded upon the supposition that they were of miscellaneous origin.[2] We do not hear, moreover, of any considerable poets produced by the Æolic continental towns. In this respect Lesbos stood alone —an island said to have been the earliest of all the Æolic settlements, anterior even to Kymê. Six towns were originally established in Lesbos—Mitylênê, Mêthymna, Eresus, Pyrrha, Antissa, and Arisbê: the last-mentioned town was subsequently enslaved and destroyed by the Methymnæans, so that there remained only five towns in all.[3] According to the political subdivision usual in Greece, the island had thus, first six, afterwards five, independent governments; of which, however, Mitylênê, situated in the south-eastern quarter and facing the promontory of Kanê, was by far the first—while Mêthymna, on the north of the island over against Cape Lekton, was the second. Like so many other Grecian colonies, the original city of Mitylênê was founded upon an islet divided from Lesbos by a narrow strait; it was subsequently extended on to Lesbos itself, so that the harbour presented two distinct entrances.[4]

Lesbos.

It appears that the native poets and fabulists who professed to deliver the archæology of Lesbos, dwelt less upon the Æolic settlers than upon the various heroes and tribes who were alleged

[1] Thucyd. ii. 9.

[2] Strabo, iv. p. 402; Thucyd. viii. 100; Pseudo-Herodot. Vit. Homer. i. Ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἡ πάλαι Αἰολιῶτις Κύμη ἐκτίζετο, συνῆλθον ἐν ταὐτῷ παντοδαπὰ ἔθνεα Ἑλληνικὰ, καὶ δὴ καὶ ἐκ Μαγνησίας, &c. Etymolog. Magn. v. Αἰολεῖς.

[3] Herodot. i. 151; Strabo, xiii. p. 590.

[4] Diodôr. xiii. 79; Strabo, xiii. p. 617; Thucyd. iii. 6.

to have had possession of the island anterior to that settlement, from the deluge of Deukaliôn downwards,—just as the Chian and Samian poets seem to have dwelt principally upon the ante-Ionic antiquities of their respective islands. After the Pelasgian Xanthus, son of Triopas, comes Makar son of Krinakus, the great native hero of the island, supposed by Plehn to be the eponym of an occupying race called the Makares. The Homeric hymn to Apollo brings Makar into connexion with the Æolic inhabitants, by calling him son of Æolus: and the native historian Myrsilus also seems to have treated him as an Æolian.[1] To dwell upon such narratives suited the disposition of the Greeks: but when we come to inquire for the history of Lesbos, we find ourselves destitute of any genuine materials not only for the period prior to the Æolic occupation, but also for a long time after it: nor can we pretend to determine at what date that occupation took place. We may reasonably believe it to have occurred before 776 B.C., and it therefore becomes a part of the earliest manifestation of real Grecian history. Both Kymê, with its eleven sister towns on the continent, and the islands Lesbos and Tenedos, were then Æolic. I have already remarked that the migration of the father of Hesiod the poet, from the Æolic Kymê to Askra in Bœotia, is the earliest authentic fact known to us on contemporary testimony,—seemingly between 776 and 700 B.C.

Early inhabitants of Lesbos before the Æolians.

But besides these islands, and the strip of the continent between Kymê and Pitanê (which constituted the territory properly called Æolis), there were many other Æolic establishments in the region near Mount Ida, the Troad, and the Hellespont, and even in European Thrace. All these establishments seem to have emanated from Lesbos, Kymê, and Tenedos, but at what time they were formed we have no information. Thirty different towns are said to have been established by these cities,[2] from whence nearly all the region of Mount Ida (meaning by that term the territory west of a line drawn

Æolic establishments in the region of Mount Ida.

[1] Hymn. ad Apollin. v. 37. Λέσβος τ' ἠγαθέη, Μάκαρος ἕδος Αἰολίωνος. Myrsilus ap. Clemen. Alexandr. Protreptic. p. 10; Diodôr. v. 57—82; Dionys. Halik. A. R. i. 18; Stephan. Byz. v. Μυτιλήνη.

Plehn (Lesbiaca, c. 2, pp. 25—37) has collected all the principal fables respecting this Lesbian archæology: compare also Raoul Rochette (Histoire des Colonies Grecques, t. i. c. 5, p. 182, &c.).

[2] Strabo, xiii. pp. 621, 622. Μέγιστον δέ ἐστι τῶν Αἰολικῶν καὶ ἀρίστη Κύμη,

from the town of Adramyttion northward, to Priapos on the Propontis) came to be Æolised. A new Æolis[1] was thus formed, quite distinct from the Æolis near the Elæitic Gulf, and severed from it partly by the territory of Atarneus, partly by the portion of Mysia and Lydia between Atarneus and Adramyttium, including the fertile plain of Thêbê. A portion of the lands on this coast seems indeed to have been occupied by Lesbos, but the far larger part of it was never Æolic. Nor was Ephorus accurate when he talked of the whole territory between Kymê and Abydos as known under the name of Æolis.[2]

The inhabitants of Tenedos possessed themselves of the strip of the Troad opposite to their island, northward of Cape Lekton—those of Lesbos founded Assus, Gargara, Lampônia, Antandrus,[3] &c., between Lekton and the north-eastern corner of the Adramyttian Gulf—while the Kymæans seem to have established themselves at Kebrên and other places in the inland Idæan district.[4] As far as we can make out, this north-western corner (west of a line drawn from Smyrna to the eastern corner of the Propontis) seems to have been occupied, anterior to the Hellenic settlements, by Mysians and Teukrians—who are mentioned together, in such manner as to show that there was no great ethnical difference between them.[5]

Continental settlements of Lesbos and Tenedos.

The elegiac poet Kallinus, in the middle of the seventh century B.C., was the first who mentioned the Teukrians, treating them as immigrants from Krête, though other authors represented them as indigenous, or as having come from Attica. However the fact may stand as to their origin, we may gather that in

Ante-Hellenic inhabitants in the region of Mount Ida, Mysians and Teukrians.

καὶ σχεδὸν μητρόπολις αὐτή τε καὶ ἡ Λέσβος τῶν ἄλλων πόλεων τριάκοντά που τὸν ἀριθμόν, &c.

[1] Xenophôn, Hellen. iii. 1, 10. μέχρι τῆς Φαρναβάζου Αἰολίδος—ἡ Αἰολὶς αὐτὴ ἦν μὲν Φαρναβάζου.

Xenophôn includes the whole of the Troad under the denomination of Æolis. Skylax distinguishes the Troad from Æolis: he designates as the Troad the coast towns from Dardanus seemingly down to Lekton: under Æolis he includes Kebrên, Skêpsis, Neandreia, and Pityeia, though how these four towns are to be called ἐπὶ θαλάσσῃ it is not easy to see (Skylax, 94, 95). Nor does Skylax notice either the Perræa of Tenedos, or Assos and Gargara.

[2] Strabo, xiii. p. 583.

[3] Thucyd. iv. 52; viii. 108. Strabo, xiii. p. 610; Stephan. Byz. Ἄσσος; Pausan. vi. 4, 5.

[4] Pseudo-Herod. Vit. Hom. c. 20:—

Ἴδης ἐν κορυφῇσι πολυπτύχου ἠνεμοέσσης,
Ἔνθα σίδηρος Ἄρηος ἐπιχθονίοισι βρότοισι
Ἔσσεται, εὖτ' ἂν μιν Κεβρήνιοι ἄνδρες ἔχωσι.

Τὰ δὲ Κεβρήνια τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον κτίζειν παρεσκευάζοντο οἱ Κυμαῖοι πρὸς τῇ Ἴδῃ, καὶ γίνεται αὐτόθι σίδηρος.

[5] Herodot. vii. 20.

the time of Kallinus they were still the great occupants of the Troad.[1] Gradually the south and west coasts, as well as the interior of this region, became penetrated by successive colonies of Æolic Greeks, to whom the iron and ship timber of Mount Ida were valuable acquisitions. Thus the small Teukrian townships (for there were no considerable cities) became Æolised: while on the coast northward of Ida, along the Hellespont and Propontis, Ionic establishments were formed from Milêtus and Phôkæa, and Milesian colonists were received into the inland town of Skêpsis.[2] In the time of Kallinus, the Teukrians seem to have been in possession of Hamaxitus and Kolônæ, with the worship of the Sminthian Apollo, in the south-western region of the Troad: a century and a half afterwards, at the time of the Ionic revolt, Herodotus notices the inhabitants of Gergis (occupying a portion of the northern region of Ida in the line eastward from Dardanus and Ophrynion) as "the remnant of the ancient Teukrians".[3] We also find the Mityleneans and Athenians contending by arms about 600—580 B.C. for the possession of Sigeium at the entrance of the Hellespont.[4] Probably the Lesbian settlements on the southern coast of the Troad, lying as they do so much nearer to the island, as well as the Tenedian settlements on the western coast opposite Tenedos, had been formed at some time prior to this epoch. We farther read of Æolic inhabitants as possessing Sestos on the European side of the Hellespont.[5] The name Teukrians gradually vanished out of present use, and came to belong only to the legends of the past; preserved either in connexion with the worship of the Sminthian Apollo, or by writers such as Hellanikus and Kephalôn of Gergis, from whence it passed to the later poets and to the Latin epic. It appears that the native place of Kephalôn was a town called Gergis or Gergithes near Kymê: there was also another place called Gergêtha on the river Kaïkus, near its sources, and therefore higher up in Mysia. It was from Gergithes near Kymê (according to Strabo), that the place called

Teukrians of Gergis.

[1] Kallinus ap. Strabo. xiii. p. 604; compare p. 613, *οὗς πρῶτος παρέδωκε Καλλῖνος*, &c.

[2] Strabo, xiii. p. 607—635.

[3] Herodot. v. 122. *εἶλε μὲν Αἰολέας πάντας, ὅσοι τὴν Ἰλιάδα νέμονται, εἶλε δὲ Γέργιθας, τοὺς ὑπολειφθέντας τῶν ἀρχαίων Τευκρῶν*, &c.

The Teukrians, in the conception of Herodotus, were the Trojans described in the Iliad—the *Τευκρὶς γῆ* seems the same as *Ἰλιὰς γῆ* (ii. 118).

[4] Herodot. v. 94.

[5] Herodot. ix. 115.

Gergis in Mount Ida was settled:[1] probably the non-Hellenic inhabitants, both near Kymê and in the region of Ida, were of kindred race, but the settlers who went from Kymê to Gergis in Ida were doubtless Greeks, and contributed in this manner to the conversion of that place from a Teukrian to an Hellenic settlement. In one of those violent dislocations of inhabitants, which were so frequent afterwards among the successors of Alexander in Asia Minor, the Teukro-Hellenic population of the Idæan Gergis is said to have been carried away by Attalus of Pergamus, in order to people the village of Gergêtha near the river Kaïkus.

We must regard the Æolic Greeks as occupying not only their twelve cities on the continent round the Elæitic Gulf, and the neighbouring islands, of which the chief were Lesbos and Tenedos —but also as gradually penetrating and hellenising the Idæan region and the Troad. This last process belongs probably to a period subsequent to 776 B.C., but Kymê and Lesbos doubtless count as Æolic from an earlier period.

Mitylênê—its political dissensions—its poets.

Of Mitylênê, the chief city of Lesbos, we hear some facts between the fortieth and fiftieth Olympiad (620—580 B.C.), which unfortunately reach us only in a faint echo. That city then numbered as its own the distinguished names of Pittakus, Sappho, and Alkæus. Like many other Grecian communities of that time, it suffered much from intestine commotion, and experienced more than one violent revolution. The old oligarchy called the Penthilids (seemingly a gens with heroic origin), rendered themselves intolerably obnoxious by misrule of the most reckless character; their brutal use of the bludgeon in the public streets was avenged by Megaklês and his friends, who slew them and put down their government.[2] About the forty-second Olympiad (612 B.C.) we hear of Melanchrus, as despot of Mitylênê, who was slain by the conspiracy of Pittakus, Kikis, and Antimenidas—the last two being brothers of Alkæus the poet. Other despots, Myrsilus, Megalagyrus, and the Kleanactidæ, whom we know only by name, and who appear to have been immortalized chiefly by the bitter stanzas of Alkæus, acquired afterwards the sovereignty of Mitylênê. Among all the citizens of the town, however, the

[1] Strabo, xiii. 589—616.

[2] Aristot. Polit. v. 8, 13.

most fortunate, and the most deserving, was Pittakus the son of Hyrrhadus—a champion trusted by his countrymen alike in foreign war and in intestine broils.[1]

Power and merit of Pittakus.

The foreign war in which the Mityleneans were engaged, and in which Pittakus commanded them, was against the Athenians on the continental coast opposite to Lesbos, in the Troad near Sigeium. The Mityleneans had already established various settlements along the Troad, the northernmost of which was Achilleium. They laid claim to the possession of the whole line of coast, and when Athens (about the 43rd Olympiad, as it is said[2]) attempted to plant a settlement at Sigeium, they resisted the establishment by force. At the head of the Mitylenean troops, Pittakus engaged in single combat with the Athenian commander Phrynôn, and had the good fortune to kill him. The general struggle was however carried on with no very decisive result. On one memorable occasion the Mityleneans fled; and Alkæus the poet, serving as an hoplite in their ranks, commemorated in one of his odes both his flight and the humiliating loss of his shield, which the victorious Athenians suspended as a trophy in the temple of Athênê at Sigeium. His predecessor Archilochus, and his imitator Horace, have both been frank enough to confess a similar misfortune, which Tyrtæus perhaps would not have endured to survive.[3] It was at length agreed by Mitylênê and Athens to refer the dispute to Periander of Corinth. While the Mityleneans laid claim to the whole line of coast, the Athenians

Alkæus the poet—his flight from battle.

[1] Diogen. Laërt. i. 74; Suidas, v. Κίκις, Πίττακος; Strabo, xiii. p. 617. Two lines of Alkæus are preserved, exulting in the death of Myrsilus (Alkæus, Fragm. 12, ed. Schneidewin). Melanchrus also is named (Fragm. 13), and Pittakus, in a third fragment (73, ed. Schneid.), is brought into connexion with Myrsilus.

[2] In regard to the chronology of this war see a note near the end of my previous chapter on the Solonian legislation. I have there noticed what I believe to be a chronological mistake of Herodotus in regard to the period between 600—560 B.C. Herodotus considers this war between the Mityleneans and Athenians, in which Pittakus and Alkæus were concerned, to have been directed by Peisistratus, whose government did not commence until 560 B.C. (Herodot. v. 94, 95).

My suspicion is, that there were two Athenian expeditions to these regions, —one (probably colonial) in the time of Alkæus and Pittakus; a second, much afterwards, undertaken by order of Peisistratus, whose illegitimate son Hegesistratus, became, in consequence, despot of Sigeium. Herodotus appears to me to have merged the two into one.

[3] See the difficult fragment of Alkæus (Fr. 24, ed. Schneidewin) preserved in Strabo, xiii. p. 600; Herodot. v. 94, 95; Archilochus, Eleg. Fr. i. 5, ed. Schneidewin; Horat. Carm. ii. 7, 9; perhaps also Anakreôn, but not certainly (see Fr. 81, ed. Schneidewin), is to be regarded as having thrown away his shield.

alleged that inasmuch as a contingent from Athens had served in the host of Agamemnôn against Troy, their descendants had as good a right as any other Greeks to share in the conquered ground. It appears that Periander felt unwilling to decide this delicate question of legendary law. He directed that each party should retain what they possessed; a verdict[1] still remembered and appealed to even in the time of Aristotle, by the inhabitants of Tenedos against those of Sigeium.

Though Pittakus and Alkæus were both found in the same line of hoplites against the Athenians at Sigeium, yet in the domestic politics of their native city, their bearing was that of bitter enemies. Alkæus and Antimenidas his brother were worsted in this party-feud, and banished: but even as exiles they were strong enough seriously to alarm and afflict their fellow-citizens, while their party at home, and the general dissension within the walls, reduced Mitylênê to despair. In this calamitous condition, the Mityleneans had recourse to Pittakus, who—with his great rank in the state (his wife belonged to the old gens of the Penthilids), courage in the field, and reputation for wisdom—inspired greater confidence than any other citizen of his time. He was by universal consent named Æsymnete or dictator for ten years, with unlimited powers:[2] and the appointment proved eminently successful. How effectually he repelled the exiles, and maintained domestic tranquillity, is best shown by the angry effusions of Alkæus; whose songs (unfortunately lost) gave vent to the political hostility of the time in the same manner as the speeches of the Athenian orators two centuries afterwards—and who, in his vigorous invectives against Pittakus, did not spare even the coarsest nicknames, founded on alleged personal deformities.[3] Respecting the proceedings of this eminent Dictator, the contemporary and reported friend of Solôn, we know only in a general way, that he succeeded in re-establishing security and peace, and that at the end of his term he voluntarily laid down his power[4]—affording presumption

Bitter opposition of Pittakus and Alkæus in internal politics.

Pittakus is created Æsymnete, or Dictator of Mitylênê.

[1] Aristot. Rhetoric, i. 16, 2, where ἔναγχος marks the date. Aristotle passed some time in these regions, at Atarneus, with the despot Hermeias.

[2] Aristot. Polit. iii. 9, 5, 6; Dionys. Halik. Ant. Rom. v. 73; Plehn, Lesbiaca, p. 46—50.

[3] Diogen. Laërt. i. 81.

[4] Strabo, xiii. p. 617; Diogen. Laërt. i. 75; Valer. Maxim. vi. 5, 1.

not only of probity superior to the lures of ambition, but also of that conscious moderation during the period of his dictatorship which left him without fear as a private citizen afterwards. He enacted various laws for Mitylênê, one of which was sufficiently curious to cause it to be preserved and commented on—for it prescribed double penalties against offences committed by men in a state of intoxication.[1] But he did not (like Solôn at Athens) introduce any constitutional changes, nor provide any new formal securities for public liberty and good government: [2] which illustrates the remark previously made, that Solôn in doing this was beyond his age and struck out new lights for his successors—since on the score of personal disinterestedness, Pittakus and he are equally unimpeachable. What was the condition of Mitylênê afterwards, we have no authorities to tell us. Pittakus is said (if the chronological computers of a latter age can be trusted) to have died in the 52nd Olympiad (B.C. 572—568). Both he and Solôn are numbered among the Seven Wise Men of Greece, respecting whom something will be said in a future chapter. The various anecdotes current about him are little better than uncertified exemplifications of a spirit of equal and generous civism: but his songs and his elegiac compositions were familiar to literary Greeks in the age of Plato.

[1] Aristot. Polit. ii. 9, 9; Rhetoric, ii. 27, 2.

A ditty is said to have been sung by the female grinding slaves in Lesbos, when the mill went heavily: Ἄλει, μύλα, ἄλει· καὶ γὰρ Πιττακὸς ἀλεῖ, Τᾶς μεγάλας Μιτυλάνας βασιλεύων—"Grind, mill, grind; for Pittakus also *grinds*, the master of great Mitylênê". This has the air of a genuine composition of the time, set forth by the enemies of Pittakus, and imputing to him (through a very intelligible metaphor) tyrannical conduct: though both Plutarch (Sept. Sap. Conv. c. 14, p. 157) and Diogenes Laërt. (i. 81) construe it literally, as if Pittakus had been accustomed to take bodily exercise at the hand-mill.

[2] Aristot. Polit. ii. 9, 9. ἐγένετο δὲ καὶ Πιττακὸς νόμων δημιουργὸς, ἀλλ' οὐ πολιτείας.

# CHAPTER XV.

## ASIATIC DORIANS.

THE islands of Rhodes, Kôs, Symê, Nisyros, Kasus, and Karpathus are represented in the Homeric catalogue as furnishing troops to the Grecian armament before Troy. Historical Rhodes and historical Kôs are occupied by Dorians, the former with its three separate cities of Lindus, Jalysus, and Kameirus. Two other Dorian cities, both on the adjacent continent, are joined with these four as members of an Amphiktyony on the Triopian promontory, or south-western corner of Asia Minor—thus constituting an Hexapolis, including Halikarnassus, Knidus, Kôs, Lindus, Jalysus, and Kameirus. Knidus was situated on the Triopian promontory itself; Halikarnassus more to the northward, on the northern coast of the Keramic Gulf: neither of the two are named in Homer.

Asiatic Dorians—their Hexapolis.

The legendary account of the origin of these Asiatic Dorians has already been given, and we are compelled to accept their Hexapolis as a portion of the earliest Grecian history, of which no previous account can be rendered. The circumstance of Rhodes and Kôs being included in the Catalogue of the Iliad leads us to suppose that they were Greek at an earlier period than the Ionic or Æolic settlements. It may be remarked that both the brothers Antiphus and Pheidippus from Kôs, and Tlêpolemus from Rhodes, are Herakleids—the only Herakleids who figure in the Iliad: and the deadly combat between Tlêpolemus and Sarpêdôn may perhaps be an heroic copy drawn from real contests, which doubtless often took place between the Rhodians and their neighbours the Lykians. That Rhodes and Kôs were already Dorian at the period of the Homeric Catalogue, I see no reason for doubting. They are not called Dorian in that Catalogue, but we may well suppose that the name Dorian had not at that early period come to be employed as a great distinctive class

name, as it was afterwards used in contrast with Ionian and Æolian. In relating the history of Pheidôn of Argos, I have mentioned various reasons for suspecting that the trade of the Dorians on the eastern coast of the Peloponnêsus was considerable at an early period, and there may well have been Doric migrations by sea to Krête and Rhodes, anterior to the time of the Iliad.

Other Dorians, not included in the Hexapolis.

Herodotus tells us that the six Dorian towns, which had established their Amphiktyony on the Triopian promontory, were careful to admit none of the neighbouring Dorians to partake of it. Of these neighbouring Dorians, we make out the islands of Astypalæa, and Kalymnæ,[1] Nisyrus, Karpathus, Symê, Têlus, Kasus, and Chalkia; also, on the continental coast, Myndus, situated on the same peninsula with Halikarnassus—and Phasêlis, on the eastern coast of Lykia towards Pamphylia. The strong coast-rock of Iasus, midway between Milêtus and Halikarnassus, is said to have been originally founded by Argeians, but was compelled in consequence of destructive wars with the Karians to admit fresh settlers and a Neleid Œkist from Milêtus.[2] Bargylia and Karyanda seem to have been Karian settlements more or less hellenised. There probably were other Dorian towns, not specially known to us, upon whom this exclusion from the Triopian solemnities was brought to operate. The six

Exclusion of Halikarnassus from the Hexapolis.

Amphiktyonised cities were in course of time reduced to five, by the exclusion of Halikarnassus: the reason for which (as we are told) was, that a citizen of Halikarnassus, who had gained a tripod as prize, violated the regulation, which required that the tripod should always be consecrated as an offering in the Triopian temple, in order that he might carry it off to decorate his own house.[3] The Dorian Amphiktyony was thus contracted into a Pentapolis. At what time this incident took place we do not know, nor is it perhaps unreasonable to conjecture that the increasing predominance of the Karian element at Halikarnassus had some effect in producing the exclusion, as well as the individual misbehaviour of the victor Agasiklês.

[1] See the Inscriptions in Boeckh's collection, 2483—2671: the latter is an Iasian Inscription, reciting a Doric decree by the inhabitants of Kalymnæ; also Ahrens, De Dialecto Dorică, p. 15.

[2] Polyb. xvi. 5.

[3] Herodot. i. 144. Diodor. v. 53, 54.

# CHAPTER XVI.

## NATIVES OF ASIA MINOR WITH WHOM THE GREEKS BECAME CONNECTED.

FROM the Grecian settlements on the coast of Asia Minor and on the adjacent islands, our attention must now be turned to those non-Hellenic kingdoms and people with whom they there came in contact.

Indigenous nations of Asia Minor —Homeric geography.

Our information with respect to all of them is unhappily very scanty. And we shall not improve our narrative by taking the catalogue, presented in the Iliad, of allies of Troy, and construing it as if it were a chapter of geography. If any proof were wanting of the unpromising results of such a proceeding, we may find it in the confusion which darkens so much of the work of Strabo—who perpetually turns aside from the actual and ascertainable condition of the countries which he is describing, to conjectures on Homeric antiquity, often announced as if they were unquestionable facts. Where the Homeric geography is confirmed by other evidence, we note the fact with satisfaction; where it stands unsupported, or difficult to reconcile with other statements, we cannot venture to reason upon it as in itself a substantial testimony. The author of the Iliad, as he has congregated together a vast body of the different sections of Greeks for the attack of the consecrated hill of Ilium, so he has also summoned all the various inhabitants of Asia Minor to co-operate in its defence. He has planted portions of the Kilikians and Lykians, whose historical existence is on the southern coast, in the immediate vicinity of the Troad. Those only will complain of this who have accustomed themselves to regard him as an historian or geographer. If we are content to read him only as the first of poets, we shall no more quarrel with him for a geographical

misplacement, than with his successor Arktinus for bringing on the battle-field of Ilium the Amazons or the Æthiopians.

Features of the country.

The geography of Asia Minor is even now very imperfectly known,[1] and the matters ascertained respecting its ancient divisions and boundaries relate almost entirely either to the later periods of the Persian empire, or to times after the Macedonian and even after the Roman conquest. To state them as they stood in the time of Crœsus king of Lydia, before the arrival of the conquering Cyrus, is a task in which we find little evidence to sustain us. The great mountain chain of Taurus, which begins from the Chelidonian promontory, on the southern coast of Lykia, and strikes north-eastward as far as Armenia, formed the most noted boundary-line during the Roman times. But Herodotus does not once mention it; the river Halys is in his view the most important geographical limit. Northward of Taurus, on the upper portions of the rivers Halys and Sangarius, was situated the spacious and lofty central plain of Asia Minor. To the north, west, and south of this central plain the region is chiefly mountainous, as it approaches all the three seas, the Euxine, the Ægean, and the Pamphylian—most mountainous in the case of the latter, permitting no rivers of long course. The mountains Kadmus, Messôgis, Tmôlus, stretch westward towards the Ægean Sea, yet leaving extensive spaces of plain and long valleys, so that the Mæander, the Kaïster, and the Hermus have each considerable length of course. The north-western part includes the mountainous regions of Ida, Têmnus, and the Mysian Olympus, with much admixture of fertile and productive ground. The elevated tracts near the Euxine appear to have been the most wooded—especially Kytôrus; the Parthenius, the Sangarius, the Halys, and the Iris are all considerable streams flowing northward towards that sea. Nevertheless, the plain land interspersed through these numerous elevations was often of the greatest fertility; and as a whole, the

[1] For the general geography of Asia Minor, see Albert Forbiger, Handbuch der Alt. Geogr. part. ii. sect. 61, and an instructive little treatise, Fünf Inschriften und fünf Städte in Klein-Asien, by Franz and Kiepert, Berlin, 1840, with a map of Phrygia annexed. The latter is particularly valuable as showing us how much yet remains to be made out: it is not unfrequently the practice with the compilers of geographical manuals to make a show of full knowledge, and to disguise the imperfection of their data. Nor do they always keep in view the necessity of distinguishing between the territorial names and divisions of one age and those of another.

peninsula of Asia Minor was considered as highly productive by the ancients, in grain, wine, fruit, cattle, and in many parts oil, though the cold central plain did not carry the olive.[1]

Names and situations of the different people.

Along the western shores of this peninsula, where the various bands of Greek emigrants settled, we hear of Pelasgians, Teukrians, Mysians, Bithynians, Phrygians, Lydians or Mæonians, Karians, Lelegians. Farther eastward are Lykians, Pisidians, Kilikians, Phrygians, Kappadokians, Paphlagonians, Mariandynians, &c. Speaking generally, we may say that the Phrygians, Teukrians, and Mysians appear in the north-western portion, between the river Hermus and the Propontis—the Karians and Lelegians south of the river Mæander,—and the Lydians in the central region between the two. Pelasgians are found here and there, seemingly both in the valley of the Hermus and in that of the Kaïster. Even in the time of Herodotus, there were Pelasgian settlements at Plakia and Skylakê on the Propontis, westward of Kyzikus: and O. Müller would trace the Tyrrhenian Pelasgians to Tyrrha, an inland town of Lydia, whence he imagines (though without much probability) the name Tyrrhenian to be derived.

Not originally aggregated into large kingdoms or cities.

One important fact to remark, in respect to the native population of Asia Minor at the first opening of this history, is, that they were not aggregated into great kingdoms or confederations, nor even into any large or populous cities—but distributed into many inconsiderable tribes, so as to present no overwhelming resistance, and threaten no formidable danger, to the successive bodies of Greek emigrants. The only exception to this is, the Lydian monarchy of Sardis, the real strength of which begins with Gygês and the dynasty of the Mermnadæ, about 700 B.C. Though the increasing force of that kingdom ultimately extinguished the independence of the Greeks in Asia, it seems to have noway impeded their development, as it stood when they first arrived and for a long time afterwards. Nor were either Karians or Mysians united under any one king, so as to possess facilities for aggression or conquest.

[1] Cic., Pro Lege Manilià, c. 6; Strabo, xii. p. 572; Herodot. v. 32. See the instructive account of the spread and cultivation of the olive tree, in Ritter, Erdkunde, West-Asien, b. iii., Abtheilung iii., Abschn. i. s. 50, p. 522—537.

As far as can be made out from our scanty data, it appears that all the nations of Asia Minor west of the river Halys, were, in a large sense, of kindred race with each other, as well as with the Thracians on the European side of the Bosphorus and Hellespont. East of the Halys dwelt the people of Syro-Arabian or Semitic race,—Assyrians, Syrians, and Kappadokians—as well as Kilikians, Pamphylians, and Solymi, along its upper course and farther southward to the Pamphylian sea. Westward of the Halys the languages were not Semitic, but belonging to a totally different family[1]—cognate yet distinct one from another, perhaps not mutually intelligible. The Karians, Lydians, and Mysians recognised a certain degree of brotherhood with each other, attested by common religious sacrifices in the temple of Zeus Karios at Mylasa.[2] But it is by no means certain that each of these nations mutually comprehended each other's speech. Herodotus, from whom we derive the knowledge of these common sacrifices, acquaints us at the same time that the Kaunians in the south-western corner of the peninsula had no share in them, though speaking the same language as the Karians. He does not, however, seem to consider identity or difference of language as a test of national affinity.

River Halys—the ethnographical boundary. Syro-Arabians eastward of that river.

Along the coast of the Euxine, from the Thracian Bosphorus eastward to the river Halys, dwelt Bithynians or Thynians, Mariandynians, and Paphlagonians—all recognised branches of the widely-extended Thracian race. The Bithynians especially, in the north-western portion of this territory, reaching from the Euxine to the Propontis, are often spoken of as Asiatic Thracians—while on the other hand various tribes among the Thracians of Europe are denominated Thyni or Thynians:[3] so little difference was there in the popula-

Thracian race—in the north of Asia Minor.

[1] Herodot. i. 72; Heeren, Ideen über den Verkehr der Alten Welt, Part. i. Abth. i. p. 142—145. It may be remarked, however, that the Armenians, eastward of the Halys, are treated by Herodotus as colonists from the Phrygians (vii. 73): Stephanus Byz. says the same v. Ἀρμενία, adding also καὶ τῇ φωνῇ πολλὰ φρυγίζουσι. The more careful researches of modern linguists, after much groundless assertion on the part of those who preceded them, have shown that the Armenian language belongs in its structure to the Indo-Germanic family, and is essentially distinct from the Semitic: see Ritter, Erdkunde, West-Asien, b. iii. Abth. iii., Abschn. i. 5, 36, p. 577—582. Herodotus rarely takes notice of the language spoken, nor does he on this occasion, when speaking of the river Halys as a boundary.

[2] Herodot. i. 170—171.

[3] Strabo, vii. pp. 295—303; xii. pp.

tion on the two sides of the Bosphorus, alike brave, predatory, and sanguinary. The Bithynians of Asia are also sometimes called Bebrykians, under which denomination they extend as far southward as the Gulf of Kios in the Propontis.[1] They here come in contact with Mygdonians, Mysians, and Phrygians. Along the southern coast of the Propontis, between the rivers Rhyndakus and Æsêpus, in immediate neighbourhood with the powerful Greek colony of Kyzikus, appear the Doliones; next, Pelasgians at Plakia and Skylakê; then again, along the coast of the Hellespont near Abydus and Lampsakus, and occupying a portion of the Troad, we find mention made of other Bebrykians.[2] In the interior of the Troad, or the region of Ida, are Teukrians and Mysians. The latter seem to extend southward down to Pergamus and the region of Mount Sipylus, and eastward to the mountainous region called the Mysian Olympus, south of the lake Askanius, near which they join with the Phrygians.[3]

As far as any positive opinion can be formed respecting nations of whom we know so little, it would appear that the Mysians and Phrygians are a sort of connecting link between Lydians and Karians on one side, and Thracians (European as well as Asiatic) on the other —a remote ethnical affinity pervading the whole. Ancient migrations are spoken of in both directions across the Hellespont and the Thracian Bosphorus. It was the opinion of some that

Ethnical affinities and migrations.

542, 564, 565, 572; Herodot. i. 28; vii. 74, 75; Xenophôn, Hellenic. i. 3, 2; Anabasis, vii. 2, 22—32. Mannert, Geographie der Gr. und Römer, b. viii. ch. ii. p. 403.

[1] Dionys. Periegêt. 805; Apollodôrus, i. 9, 20. Theokritus puts the Bebrykians on the coast of the Euxine—Id. xxii. 29; Syncell. p. 340, Bonn. The story in Appian, Bell. Mithridat. init., is a singular specimen of Grecian fancy, and anxiety to connect the antiquities of a nation with the Trojan war. The Greeks whom he followed assigned the origin of the Bithynians to Thracian followers of Rhêsus, who fled from Troy after the latter had been killed by Diomêdês: Dolonkus, eponym of the Thracians in the Chersonesus, is called brother of Bithynus (Steph. Byz. Δόλογκος—Βιθυνία).

The name Μαριαν-δυνοί, like Βιθυνοί, may probably be an extension or compound of the primitive Θυνοί; perhaps also Βέβρυκες stands in the same relation to Βριγές or Φρυγές. Hellanikus wrote Θύμβριον, Δύμβριον (Steph. Byz. in v.).

Kios is Mysian in Herodotus, v. 122: according to Skylax, the coast from the Gulf of Astakus to that of Kios is Mysia (c. 93).

[2] Charôn of Lampsakus, Fr. 7, ed. Didot. Χάρων δὲ φησὶ καὶ τὴν Λαμψακηνῶν χώραν προτέραν Βεβρυκίαν καλεῖσθαι ἀπὸ τῶν κατοικησάντων αὐτὴν Βεβρύκων· τὸ δὲ γένος αὐτῶν ἠφάνισται διὰ τοὺς γενομένους πολέμους. Strabo, xiii. p. 586; Conôn, Narr. 12; Dionys. Hal. i. 54.

[3] Hekatæus, Frag. 204, ed. Didot; Apollodôr. i. 9, 18; Strabo, xii. p. 564—575.

Phrygians, Mysians, and Thracians had immigrated into Asia from Europe; and the Lydian historian Xanthus referred the arrival of the Phrygians to an epoch subsequent to the Trojan war.[1] On the other hand, Herodotus speaks of a vast body of Teukrians and Mysians, who, before the Trojan war, had crossed the strait from Asia into Europe, expelled many of the European Thracians from their seats, crossed the Strymôn and the Macedonian rivers, and penetrated as far southward as the river Pênēus in Thessaly —as far westward as the Ionic Gulf. This Teukro-Mysian migration (he tells us) brought about two consequences: first, the establishment near the river Strymôn of the Pæonians, who called themselves Teukrian colonists;[2] next, the crossing into Asia of many of the dispossessed Thracian tribes from the neighbourhood of the Strymôn into the north-western region of Asia Minor, by which the Bithynian or Asiatic Thracian people was formed. The Phrygians also are supposed by some to have originally occupied an European soil on the borders of Macedonia near the snow-clad Mount Bermion, at which time they were called Briges,—an appellative name in the Lydian language equivalent to freemen or Franks:[3] while the Mysians are said to have come from the northern-eastern portions of European Thrace south of the Danube, known under the Roman empire by the name of Mœsia.[4] But with respect to the Mysians there was also another story, according to which they were described as colonists emanating from the Lydians; put forth according to that system of devoting by solemn vow a tenth of the inhabitants, chosen by lot, to seek settlements elsewhere, which recurs not unfrequently among the stories of early emigrations, as the consequence of distress and famine. And this last opinion was supported by the character of the Mysian language, half Lydian and half Phrygian, of which both the Lydian historian Xanthus, and Menekratês of Elæa[5] (by whom the opinion was announced), must have been very competent judges.

1 Xanth. Fragm. 5, ed. Didot.
2 Herodot. vii. 20—75.
3 Strabo, vii. p. 295; xii. p. 550: Herodot. vii. 73: Hesych. v. Βρίγα.
4 Strabo, vii. p. 295; xii. pp. 542, 564, 571, where he cites the geographer Artemidôrus. In the passage of the Iliad (xiii. 5), the Μυσοὶ ἀγχέμαχοι appear to be conceived by the poet in European Thrace; but Apollodôrus does not seem to have so construed the passage. Niebuhr (Kleine Schriften, p. 370) expresses himself more confidently than the evidence warrants.
5 Strabo, xii. p. 572; Herodot. vii. 74.

From such tales of early migration both ways across the Hellespont and the Bosphorus, all that we can with any certainty infer is, a certain measure of affinity among the population of Thrace and Asia Minor—especially visible in the case of the Phrygians and Mysians. The name and legends of the Phrygian hero Midas are connected with different towns throughout the extensive region of Asiatic Phrygia--Kelænæ, Pessinûs, Ankyra,[1] Gordium—as well as with the neighbourhood of Mount Bermion in Macedonia. The adventure whereby Midas got possession of Silênus, mixing wine with the spring of which he drank, was localised at the latter place as well as at the town of Thymbrion, nearly at the eastern extremity of Asiatic Phrygia.[2] The name Mygdonia, and the eponymous hero Mygdôn, belong not less to the European territory near the river Axius (afterwards a part of Macedonia) than to the Asiatic coast of the eastern Propontis, between Kios and the river Rhyndakus.[3] Otreus and Mygdôn are the commanders of the Phrygians in the Iliad; and the river Odrysês, which flowed through the territory of the Asiatic Mygdonians into the Rhyndakus, affords another example of homonymy with the Odrysian Thracians[4] in Europe. And as these coincidences of names and legends conduct us to the idea of analogy and affinity between Thracians and Phrygians, so we find Archilochus, the earliest poet remaining to us who mentions them as contemporaries, coupling the two in the same simile.[5] To this early

Partial identity of legends.

[1] Diodor. iii. 59; Arrian, ii. 3, 1; Quint. Curt. iii. 1, 12: Athenæ. x. p. 415. We may also notice the town of Κοτυάειον near Μιδάειον in Phrygia, as connected with the name of the Thracian goddess *Kotys* (Strabo, x. p. 470; xii. p. 576).

[2] Herodot. viii. 138; Theopompus, Frag. 74, 75, 76, Didot (he introduced a long dialogue between Midas and Silênus—Dionys. Halik. Vett. Script. Censur. p. 70; Theôn. Progymnas. c. 2); Strabo, xiv. p. 680; Xenophôn, Anabas. i. 2, 13.

[3] Strabo, vii. p. 575, 576; Steph. Byz. Μυγδονία; Thucyd. ii. 99. The territory Mygdonia and the Mygdonians, in the distant region of Mesopotamia, eastward of the river Chaboras (Plutarch, Lucullus, 32; Polyb. v. 51; Xenophôn, Anab. iv. 3, 4), is difficult to understand, since it is surprising to find a branch of these more westerly Asiatics in the midst of the Syro-Arabian population. Strabo (xv. p. 747) justly supposes it to date only from the times of the Macedonian conquest of Asia, which would indeed be disproved by the mention of the name in Xenophôn; but this reading *in the text of* Xenophôn is rejected by the best recent editors, since several MSS. have Μαρδόνιοι in place of Μυγδόνιοι. See Forbiger, Handbuch der Alten Geographie, Part ii. sect. 98, p. 628.

[4] Iliad, iii. 188; Strabo, xii. p. 551. The town of Otræa, of which Otreus seems to be the eponymus, was situated in Phrygia just on the borders of Bithynia (Strabo, xii. p. 566).

[5] Archiloch. Fragm. 28 Schneid., 26 Gaisf.—

Parian Iambist, the population on the two sides of the Hellespont appears to have presented similarity of feature and customs.

Phrygians.

To settle with any accuracy the extent and condition of these Asiatic nations during the early days of Grecian settlement among them is impracticable. The problem was not to be solved even by the ancient geographers, with their superior means of knowledge. The early indigenous distribution of the Phrygian population is unknown to us; for even the division into the Greater and Lesser Phrygia belongs to a period at least subsequent to the Persian conquest (like most of the recognised divisions of Asia Minor), and is only misleading if applied to the period earlier than Crœsus. It appears that the name Phrygians, like that of Thracians, was a generic designation, and comprehended tribes or separate communities who had also specific names of their own. We trace Phrygians at wide distances: on the western bank of the river Halys—at Kelænæ, in the interior of Asia Minor, on the upper course of the river Mæander—and on the coast of the Propontis near Kios. In both of these latter localities there is a salt lake called Askanius, which is the name both of the leader of the Phrygian allies of Troy and of the country from whence they are said to come, in the Iliad.[1] They thus occupy a territory bounded on the south by the Pisidian mountains—on the west by the Lydians (indicated by a terminal pillar set up by Crœsus at Kydrara[2])—on the east by the river Halys, on the other side of which were Kappadokians or Syrians—on the north by Paphlagonians and Mariandynians. But it seems besides this, that they must have extended farther to the west, so as to occupy a great portion of the region of

. . . . ὥσπερ αὐλῷ βρῦτον ἢ Θρῇξ ἀνὴρ
Ἡ Φρὺξ ἔβρυζε, &c.

The passage is too corrupt to support any inference, except the near approximation in the poet's mind of Thracians and Phrygians. The phrase αὐλῷ βρῦτον βρύζειν is probably to be illustrated by the Anabasis of Xenophôn (iv. 5, 27), where he describes the half-starved Greek soldiers refreshing themselves in the Armenian villages. They found there large bowls full of barley-wine or beer, with the grains of barley floating in it. They drank the liquid by sucking through long reeds or straws without any joint in them (κάλαμοι γονατα οὐκ ἔχοντες) which they found put there for the express purpose.

[1] Iliad, ii. 873; xiii. 792; Arrian, i. 29; Herodot. vii. 30. The boundary of the Phrygians southward towards the Pisidians, and westward as well as north-westward towards the Lydians and Mysians, could never be distinctly traced (Strabo, xii. pp. 564, 576, 628): the volcanic region called Katakekaumenê is referred in Xenophôn's time to Mysia (Anabas. i. 2, 10): compare the remarks of Kiepert in the treatise above referred to: Fünf Inschriften und fünf Städte, p. 27.

[2] Herodot. i. 72; vii. 30.

Mount Ida and the Troad. For Apollodôrus considered that both the Doliones and the Bebrykians were included in the great Phrygian name;[1] and even in the ancient poem called "Phorônis" (which can hardly be placed later than 600 B.C.), the Daktyls of Mount Ida, the great discoverers of metallurgy, are expressly named Phrygian.[2] The custom of the Attic tragic poets to call the inhabitants of the Troad Phrygians, does not necessarily imply any translation of inhabitants, but an employment of the general name, as better known to the audience whom they addressed, in preference to the less notorious specific name—just as the inhabitants of Bithynia might be described either as Bithynians or as Asiatic Thracians.

Their influence upon the early Greek colonists.

If (as the language of Herodotus and Ephorus[3] would seem to imply) we suppose the Phrygians to be at a considerable distance from the coast and dwelling only in the interior, it will be difficult to explain to ourselves how or where the early Greek colonists came to be so much influenced by them; whereas the supposition that the tribes occupying the Troad and the region of Ida were Phrygians elucidates this point. And the fact is incontestable, that both Phrygians and Lydians did not only modify the religious manifestations of the Asiatic Greeks, and through them of the Grecian world generally, but also rendered important aid towards the first creation of the Grecian musical scale. Of this the denominations of the scale afford a proof.

Greek musical scale—partly borrowed from the Phrygians.

Three primitive musical modes were employed by the Greek poets, in the earliest times of which later authors could find any account—the Lydian, which was the most acute—the Dorian, which was the most grave—and the Phrygian intermediate between the two; the highest note of the Lydian being one tone higher, that of the Dorian one tone lower, than the highest note of the Phrygian scale.[4] Such were the three modes or scales, each

[1] Strabo, xiv. p. 678: compare xiii. p. 586. The legend makes Doliôn son of Silènus, who is so much connected with the Phrygian Midas (Alexand. Ætolus ap. Strab. xiv. p. 681).

[2] Phorônis, Fragm. 5, ed. Düntzer, p. 57—

. . . . ἔνθα γόητες Ἰδαῖοι Φρύγες ἄνδρες, ὀρέστεροι, οἷκαδ' ἔναιον, &c.

[3] Ephorus ap. Strabo. xiv. p. 678: Herodot. v. 49.

[4] See the learned and valuable Dissertation of Boeckh, De Metris Pindari, iii. 8 p. 235—239.

including only a tetrachord, upon which the earliest Greek masters worked: many other scales, both higher and lower, were subsequently added. It thus appears that the earliest Greek music was, in large proportion, borrowed from Phrygia and Lydia. When we consider that in the eighth and seventh centuries before the Christian æra, music and poetry conjoined (often also with dancing or rhythmical gesticulation) was the only intellectual manifestation known among the Greeks—and moreover, that in the belief of all the ancient writers, every musical mode had its own peculiar emotional influences, powerfully modified the temper of hearers, and was intimately connected with the national worship—we shall see that this transmission of the musical modes implies much both of communication and interchange between the Asiatic Greeks and the indigenous population of the continent. Now the fact of communication between the Ionic and the Æolic Greeks, and their eastern neighbours, the Lydians, is easy to comprehend generally, though we have no details as to the way in which it took place. But we do not distinctly see where it was that the Greeks came so much into contact with the Phrygians, except in the region of Ida, the Troad, and the southern coast of the Propontis. To this region belonged those early Phrygian musicians (under the heroic names of Olympus, Hyagnis, Marsyas), from whom the Greeks borrowed.[1] And we may remark that the analogy between Thracians and Phrygians seems partly to hold in respect both to music and to religion; since the old mythe in the Iliad, wherein the Thracian bard Thamyris, rashly contending in song with the Muses, is conquered, blinded and stripped of his art, seems to be the prototype of the very similar story respecting the contention of

[1] Plutarch, De Musicâ, c. 5, 7, p. 1132; Aristoxenus ap. Athenæ. xiv. p. 624; Alkman, Frag. 104, ed. Bergk.

Aristoxenus seems to have considered the Phrygian Olympus as the great inventive genius who gave the start to Grecian music (Plutarch, *ib.* p. 1135—1141): his music was employed almost entirely for hymns to the gods, religious worship, the Mêtrôa or ceremonies in honour of the Great Mother (p. 1140). Compare Clemen. Alexand. Strom. i. p. 306.

Μαρσύας may perhaps have its etymology in the Karian or Lydian language. Σούας was in Karian equivalent to τάφος (see Steph. Byz. v. Σουαγελα): Μᾶ was one of the various names of Rhea (Steph. Byz. v. Μάσταυρα). The word would have been written Μαρσούας by an Æolic Greek.

Marsyas is represented by Telestês the dithyrambist as a satyr, son of a nymph—νυμφαγενεῖ χειροκτύπῳ φηρὶ Μαρσύᾳ κλέος (Telestês ap. Athenæ. xiv. p. 617).

Apollo with the Phrygian Marsyas[1]—the cithara against the flute; while the Phrygian Midas is farther characterised as the religious disciple of Thracian Orpheus.

Phrygian music and worship among the Greeks in Asia Minor.

In my previous chapter relating to the legend of Troy,[2] mention has been already made of the early fusion of the Æolic Greeks with the indigenous population of the Troad. It is from hence probably that the Phrygian music with the flute as its instrument—employed in the orgiastic rites and worship of the Great Mother in Mount Ida, in the Mysian Olympus, and other mountain regions of the country, and even in the Greek city of Lampsakus[3]—passed to the Greek composers. Its introduction is coæval with the earliest facts respecting Grecian music, and must have taken place during the first century of the recorded Olympiads. In the Homeric poems we find no allusion to it, but it may probably have contributed to stimulate that development of lyric and elegiac composition which grew up among the post-homeric Æolians and Ionians, to the gradual displacement of the old epic. Another instance of the fusion of Phrygians with Greeks is to be found in the religious ceremonies of Kyzikus, Kius, and Prusa, on the southern and south-eastern coasts of the Propontis. At the first of the three places, the worship of the Great Mother of the Gods was celebrated with much solemnity on the hill of Dindymon, bearing the same name as that mountain in the interior, near Pessinus, from whence Cybelê derived her principal surname of Dindymênê.[4] The analogy between the Kretan and Phrygian religious practices has been often noticed, and confusion occurs not unfrequently between Mount Ida in Krête and the mountain of the same name in the Troad; while the Teukrians of Gergis in the Troad—who were not yet Hellenised even at the time of

[1] Xenoph. Anab. i. 2, 8; Homer, Iliad, ii. 595; Strabo, xii. p. 578: the latter connects Olympus with Kelænæ, as well as Marsyas. Justin, xi. 7: "Mida, qui ab Orpheo sacrorum solemnibus initiatus, Phrygiam religionibus implevit".

The coins of Midaeion, Kadi, and Prymnêssus, in the more northerly portion of Phrygia, bear the impress of the Phrygian hero Midas (Eckhel, Doctrina Nummorum Vet. iii. p. 143—168).

[2] Part I. ch. xv.

[3] The fragment of Hippônax mentioning an eunuch of Lampsakus, rich and well-fed, reveals to us the Asiatic habits, and probably worship, in that place (Fragm. 26, ed. Bergk):—

Θύνναν τε καὶ μυττωτὸν ἡμέρας πάσας
Δαινύμενος, ὥσπερ Λαμψακηνὸς εὐνοῦχος, &c.

[4] Strabo, xii. p. 564—575; Herodot. iv. 76.

the Persian invasion, and who were affirmed by the elegiac poet Kallinus to have immigrated from Krête—if they were not really Phrygians, differed so little from them as to be called such by the poets.

Character of Phrygians, Lydians, and Mysians.

The Phrygians are celebrated by Herodotus for the abundance both of their flocks and their agricultural produce.[1] The excellent wool for which Milêtus was always renowned came in part from the upper valley of the river Mæander, which they inhabited. He contrasts them in this respect with the Lydians, among whom the attributes and capacities of persons dwelling in cities are chiefly brought to our view: much gold and silver, retail trade, indigenous games, unchastity of young women, yet combined with thrift and industry.[2] Phrygian cheese and salt-provisions—Lydian unguents,[3] carpets and coloured shoes—acquired notoriety. Both Phrygians and Lydians are noticed by Greek authors subsequent to the establishment of the Persian empire as a people timid, submissive, industrious, and useful as slaves—an attribute not ascribed to the Mysians,[4] who are usually described as brave and hardy mountaineers, difficult to hold in subjection: nor even true respecting the Lydians during the earlier times anterior to the complete overthrow of Crœsus by Cyrus; for they were then esteemed for their warlike prowess. Nor was the different character of these two Asiatic people yet effaced even in the second century after the Christian æra. For the same Mysians, who in the time of Herodotus and Xenophôn gave so much trouble to the Persian satraps, are described by the rhetor Aristeidês as seizing and plundering his property at Laneion near Hadriani—while on the contrary he mentions the Phrygians as habitually coming from the interior towards the coast regions to do the work of the olive-gathering.[5] During the times of Grecian autonomy and ascendency,

[1] Herodot. v. 49. πολυπροβατώτατοι καὶ πολυκαρπότατοι.

[2] Herodot. i. 93, 94.

[3] Τάριχος Φρύγιον (Eupolis, Marik. Fr. 23, p. 596, Meineke)—τυρός, Athenæ. xii. 516—ἰσχάδες, Alexis ap. Athenæ. iii. 75: *some* Phrygians, however, had never seen a fig-tree (Cicero pro Flacco, c. 17).

Carpets of Sardis (Athenæ. v. 197): φοινικίδες Σαρδιανικαί (Plato Comicus ap. Athenæ. ii. 48); Ἀεὶ φιλόμυρον πᾶν τὸ Σάρδεων γένος (Alexis ap. Athenæ. xv. p. 691, and again *ib.* p. 690); Πόδας δὲ Ποίκιλος μάσθλης ἐκάλυπτε Λύδιον καλὸν ἔργον (Sappho, Fragm. 54. ed. Schneidewin; Schol. Aristoph. Pac. 1174).

[4] Xenophôn, Anabas. i. 6, 7; iii. 2. 23; Memorab. iii. 5, 26, ἀκοντισταὶ Μυσοὶ: Æschyl. Pers. 40, ἀβροδίαιτοι Λύδοι.

[5] Aristeid. Orat. xxvi. p. 346. The λόφος Ἄτυος was very near to this place

in the fifth century B.C., the conception of a Phrygian or a Lydian was associated in the Greek mind with ideas of contempt and servitude,[1] to which unquestionably these Asiatics became fashioned, since it was habitual with them under the Roman empire to sell their own children into slavery[2]—a practice certainly very rare among the Greeks, even when they too had become confounded among the mass of subjects of imperial Rome. But we may fairly assume that this association of contempt with the name of a Phrygian or a Lydian did not prevail during the early period of Grecian Asiatic settlement, or even in the time of Alkman, Mimnermus, or Sappho, down to 600 B.C. We first trace evidence of it in a fragment of Hippônax. It began with the subjection of Asia Minor generally, first under Crœsus[3] and then under Cyrus, and with the sentiment of comparative pride which grew up afterwards in the minds of European Greeks. The native Phrygian tribes along the Propontis, with whom the Greek colonists came in contact—Bebrykians, Doliones, Mygdonians, &c.—seem to have been agricultural, cattle-breeding, and horse-breeding; yet more vehement and warlike than the Phrygians of the interior, as far at least as can be made out by their legends. The brutal but gigantic Amykus son of Poseidôn, chief of the Bebrykians, with whom Pollux contends in boxing—and his brother Mygdôn, to whom Hêraklês is opposed—are samples of a people whom the Greek poets considered ferocious and not submissive;[4] while the celebrity of the horses of Erich-

Laneion, which shows the identity of the religious names throughout Lydia and Mysia (Or. xxv. p. 318). About the Phrygians, Aristeidês, Orat. xlvi. p. 308, Τῶν δὲ πλουσίων ἕνεκα εἰς τὴν ὑπεροψίαν ἀπαίρουσιν, ὥσερ οἱ Φρύγες τῶν ἐλαῶν ἕνεκα τῆς συλλογῆς.

The declamatory prolixities of Aristeidês offer little reward to the reader except these occasional valuable evidences of existing custom.

[1] Hermippus ap. Athenæ. i. p. 27. Ἀνδράποδ' ἐκ Φρυγίας, &c., the saying ascribed to Sokratês in Ælian, V. H. x. 14; Euripid. Alcest. 691; Xenophôn, Agesilaus, i. 21; Strabo, vii. p. 304; Polyb. iv. 38. The Thracians sold their children into slavery (Herod. v. 6)—as the Circassians at present (Clarke's Travels, vol. i. p. 378).

Δειλότερος λάγω Φρυγός was a Greek proverb (Strabo, i. p. 36; compare Cicero pro Flacco, c. 27).

[2] Philostrat. Vit. Apollon. viii. 7, 12, p. 346. The slave-merchants seem to have visited Thessaly, and to have bought slaves at Pagasæ; these were either Penests sold by their masters out of the country, or perhaps non-Greeks procured from the borderers in the interior (Aristoph. Plutus, 521; Hermippus ap. Athenæ. i. p. 27—Αἱ Παγασαὶ δούλους καὶ στιγματίας παρέχουσι.

[3] Phrygian slaves seem to have been numerous at Milêtus in the time of Hippônax, Frag. 36, ed. Bergk:—

Καὶ τοὺς σολοίκους, ἢν λάβωσι, περνᾶσιν,
Φρύγας μὲν ἐς Μίλητον ἀλφιτεύσοντας.

[4] Theocrit. Idyll. xxii. 47—133; Apollôn. Rhod. i. 937—954; ii. 5—140; Valer. Flacc. iv. 109; Apollodôr. ii. 5, 9.

thonius, Laomedôn, and Asius of Arisbê, in the Iliad, shows that horse-breeding was a distinguishing attribute of the region of Ida, not less in the mind of Homer than in that of Virgil.[1]

Primitive Phrygian king or hero Gordius.

According to the legend of the Phrygian town of Gordium on the river Sangarius, the primitive Phrygian king Gordius was originally a poor husbandman, upon the yoke of whose team, as he one day tilled his field, an eagle perched and posted himself. Astonished at this portent, he consulted the Telmissean augurs to know what it meant, when a maiden of the prophetic breed acquainted him that the kingdom was destined to his family. He espoused her, and the offspring of the marriage was Midas. Sedition afterwards breaking out among the Phrygians, they were directed by an oracle, as the only means of tranquillity, to choose for themselves as king the man whom they should first see approaching in a waggon. Gordius and Midas happened to be then coming into the town in their waggon, and the crown was conferred upon them. Their waggon, consecrated in the citadel of Gordium to Zeus Basileus, became celebrated from the insoluble knot whereby the yoke was attached, and from the severance of it afterwards by the sword of Alexander the Great. Whosoever could untie the knot, to him the kingdom of Asia was portended, and Alexander was the first whose sword both fulfilled the condition and realised the prophecy.[2]

Midas.

Of these legendary Phrygian names and anecdotes we can make no use for historical purposes. We know nothing of any Phrygian kings during the historical times; but Herodotus tells us of a certain Midas son of Gordius, king of Phrygia, who was the first foreign sovereign that ever sent offerings to the Delphian temple, anterior to Gygês of Lydia. This Midas dedicated to the Delphian god the throne on which he was in the habit of sitting to administer justice. Chronologers have referred the incident to a Phrygian king Midas placed by Eusebius in the tenth Olympiad—a sup-

[1] Iliad. ii. 138; xii. 97; xx. 219; Virgil, Georgic. iii. 270:—

"Illas ducit amor (equas) trans Gargara, transque sonantem
Ascanium," &c.

Klausen (Æneas und die Penaten, vol. i. pp. 52—56, 102—107) has put together with great erudition all the legendary indications respecting these regions.

[2] Arrian, ii. 3; Justin, xi. 7.

According to another tale, Midas was son of the Great Mother herself (Plutarch, Cæsar, 9; Hygin. fab. 191).

position which there are no means of verifying.[1] There may have been a real Midas king of Gordium ; but that there was ever any great united Phrygian monarchy, we have not the least ground for supposing. The name Gordius son of Midas again appears in the legend of Crœsus and Solôn told by Herodotus, as part of the genealogy of the ill-fated prince Adrastus : here too it seems to represent a legendary rather than a real person.[2]

Of the Lydians I shall speak in the following chapter.

[1] Herodot. i. 14, with Wesseling's note

[2] Herodot. i. 34

## CHAPTER XVII.

### LYDIANS.—MEDES.—CIMMERIANS.—SCYTHIANS.

THE early relations between the Lydians and the Asiatic Greeks, anterior to the reign of Gygês, are not better known to us than those of the Phrygians. Their native music became partly incorporated with the Greek, as the Phrygian music was; to which it was very analogous, both in instruments and in character, though the Lydian mode was considered by the ancients as more effeminate and enervating. The flute was used alike by Phrygians and Lydians, passing from both of them to the Greeks. But the magadis or pectis (a harp with sometimes as many as twenty strings, sounded two together in octave) is said to have been borrowed by the Lesbian Terpander from the Lydian banquets.[1] The flute-players who acquired esteem among the early Asiatic Greeks were often Phrygian or Lydian slaves; and even the poet Alkman, who gained for himself permanent renown among the Greek lyric poets, though not a slave born at Sardis, as is sometimes said, was probably of Lydian extraction.

Lydians—their music and instruments.

It has been already mentioned that Homer knows nothing of Lydia or Lydians. He names Mæonians in juxtaposition with Karians, and we are told by Herodotus that the people once called Mæonian received the new appellation of Lydian from Lydus son of Atys. Sardis, whose almost inexpugnable citadel was situated on a precipitous rock on the northern side of the ridge of Tmôlus, overhanging the plain of the river Hermus, was the capital of the Lydian kings. It is not named by Homer, though he mentions

They and their capital Sardis unknown to Homer.

[1] Pindar. ap. Athenæ. xiv. p. 635; compare Telestês ap. Athenæ. xiv. p. 626; Pausan. iv. 5, 4

both Tmôlus and the neighbouring Gygæan lake: the fortification of it was ascribed to an old Lydian king named Mêlês, and strange legends were told concerning it.[1] Its possessors were enriched by the neighbourhood of the river Paktôlus, which flowed down from Mount Tmôlus towards the Hermus, bringing considerable quantities of gold in its sands. To this cause historians often ascribe the abundant treasure belonging to Crœsus and his predecessors. But Crœsus possessed, besides, other mines near Pergamus;[2] while another cause of wealth is also to be found in the general industry of the Lydian people, which the circumstances mentioned respecting them seem to attest. They were the first people (according to Herodotus) who ever carried on retail trade, and the first to coin money of gold and silver.[3]

Early Lydian kings.

The archæologists of Sardis in the time of Herodotus (a century after the Persian conquest) carried very far back the antiquity of the Lydian monarchy, by means of a series of names which are in great part, if not altogether, divine and heroic. Herodotus gives us first Manês, Atys, and Lydus—next a line of kings beginning with Hêraklês, twenty-two in number, succeeding each other from father to son and lasting for 505 years. The first of this line of Herakleid kings was Agrôn, descended from Hêraklês in the fourth generation—Hêraklês, Alkæus, Ninus, Bêlus, and Agrôn. The twenty-second prince of this Herakleid family, after an uninterrupted succession of father and son during 505 years, was Kandaulês, called by the Greeks Myrsilus the son of Myrsus. With him the dynasty ended, and ended by one of those curious incidents which Herodotus has narrated with his usual dramatic, yet unaffected, emphasis. It was the divine will that Kandaulês should be destroyed, and he lost his rational judgment. Having a wife the most beautiful woman in Lydia, his vanity could not be satisfied without exhibiting her naked person to Gygês son of Daskylus, his principal confidant and the commander of his guards. In spite of the vehement repugnance of Gygês, this resolution was executed; but the wife became aware of the inexpiable affront, and took her measures to avenge it. Surrounded by her most faithful domestics, she sent for Gygês, and addressed him:—"Two ways are now

[1] Herodot. i. 84. [2] Aristot. Mirabil. Auscultat. 52. [3] Herodot. i. 94.

open to thee, Gygês: take which thou wilt. Either kill Kandaulês, wed me, and acquire the kingdom of Lydia—or else thou must at once perish. For thou hast seen forbidden things, and either thou, or the man who contrived it for thee, must die." Gygês in vain entreated to be spared so terrible an alternative: he was driven to the option, and he chose that which promised safety to himself.[1] The queen, planting him in ambush behind the bed-chamber door, in the very spot where Kandaulês had placed him as a spectator, armed him with a dagger, which he plunged into the heart of the sleeping king.

Kandaulês and Gygês.

Thus ended the dynasty of the Herakleids; yet there was a large party in Lydia who indignantly resented the death of Kandaulês, and took arms against Gygês. A civil war ensued, which both parties at length consented to terminate by reference to the Delphian oracle. The decision of that holy referee being given in favour of Gygês, the kingdom of Lydia passed to his dynasty, called the Mermnadæ. But the oracle accompanied its verdict with an intimation that in the person of the fifth descendant of Gygês, the murder of Kandaulês would be avenged—a warning of which (Herodotus innocently remarks) no one took any notice, until it was actually fulfilled in the person of Crœsus.[2]

The Mermnad dynasty succeeds to the Herakleid.

In this curious legend, which marks the commencement of the dynasty called Mermnadæ, the historical kings of Lydia—we cannot determine how much, or whether any part, is historical. Gygês was probably a real man, contemporary with the youth of the poet Archilochus; but the name Gygês is also an heroic name in Lydian archæology. He is the eponymus of the Gygæan lake near Sardis. Of the many legends told respecting him, Plato has preserved one, according to which Gygês is a mere herdsman of the king of Lydia: after a terrible storm and earthquake he sees near him a chasm in the earth, into which he descends and finds a vast horse of brass, hollow and partly open, wherein there lies a gigantic corpse with a golden ring. This ring he carries away, and discovers unexpectedly that

Legend of Gygês in Plato.

[1] Herodot. i. 13. αἱρέεται αὐτὸς περιεῖναι—a phrase to which Gibbon has ascribed an intended irony which it is difficult to discover in Herodotus.

[2] Herodot. i. 13. τούτου τοῦ ἔπεος . . . λόγον οὐδένα ἐποιεῦντο, πρὶν δὴ ἐπετελέσθη.

it possesses the miraculous property of rendering him invisible at pleasure. Being sent on a message to the king he makes the magic ring available to his ambition. He first possesses himself of the person of the queen, then with her aid assassinates the king, and finally seizes the sceptre.[1]

The legend thus recounted by Plato, thoroughly Oriental in character, has this one point in common with the Herodotean, that the adventurer Gygês, through the favour and help of the queen, destroys the king and becomes his successor. Feminine preference and patronage are the cause of his prosperity. Klausen has shown[2] that this "aphrodisiac influence" runs in a peculiar manner through many of the Asiatic legends, both divine and heroic. The Phrygian Midas or Gordius (as before recounted) acquires the throne by marriage with a divinely privileged maiden: the favour, shown by Aphroditê to Anchisês, confers upon the Æneadæ sovereignty in the Troad: moreover the great Phrygian and Lydian goddess Rhea or Cybelê has always her favoured and self-devoting youth Atys, who is worshipped along with her, and who serves as a sort of mediator between her and mankind. The feminine element appears predominant in Asiatic myths. Midas, Sardanapalus, Sandôn, and even Hêraklês,[3] are described as clothed in women's attire and working at the loom; while on the other hand the Amazons and Semiramis achieve great conquests.

Feminine influence running through the legends of Asia Minor.

Admitting therefore the historical character of the Lydian kings called Mermnadæ, beginning with Gygês about 715—690 B.C., and ending with Crœsus, we find nothing but legend to explain to us the circumstances which led to their accession. Still less can we make out anything respecting the preceding kings, or determine whether Lydia was ever in former times connected with or dependent upon the kingdom of Assyria, as Ktêsias affirmed.[4] Nor can we certify the reality or dates of the

[1] Plato, Republ. ii. p 360; Cicero, Offic. iii. 9. Plato (Republ. x. p. 612) compares very suitably the ring of Gygês to the helmet of Hadês.

[2] See Klausen, Æneas und die Penaten, pp. 34, 110, &c.: compare Menke, Lydiaca, ch. 8, 9.

[3] See the article of O. Müller in the Rheinisch. Museum für Philologie, Jahrgang iii. p. 22—38; also Movers, Die Phönizier, ch. xii. p. 452—470.

[4] Diodôr. ii. 2. Niebuhr also conceives that Lydia was in early days a portion of the Assyrian empire (Kleine Schriften, p. 371).

old Lydian kings named by the native historian Xanthus,—Alkimus, Kamblês, Adramytês.[1] One piece of valuable information, however, we acquire from Xanthus—the distribution of Lydia into two parts, Lydia proper and Torrhêbia, which he traces to the two sons of Atys—Lydus and Torrhêbus; he states that the dialect of the Lydians and Torrhêbians differed much in the same degree as that of Doric and Ionic Greeks.[2] Torrhêbia appears to have included the valley of the Kaïster, south of Tmôlus, and near to the frontiers of Karia.

Distribution of Lydia into two parts—Lydia and Torrhêbia.

With Gygês, the Mermnad king, commences the series of aggressions from Sardis upon the Asiatic Greeks, which ultimately ended in their subjection. Gygês invaded the territories of Milêtus and Smyrna, and even took the city (probably not the citadel) of Kolophôn. Though he thus however made war upon the Asiatic Greeks, he was munificent in his donations to the Grecian god of Delphi. His numerous as well as costly offerings were seen in the temple by Herodotus. Elegiac compositions of the poet Mimnermus celebrated the valour of the Smyrnæans in their battle with Gygês.[3] We hear also, in a story which bears the impress of Lydian more than of Grecian fancy, of a beautiful youth of Smyrna named Magnês, to whom Gygês was attached, and who incurred the displeasure of his countrymen for having composed verses in celebration of the victories of the Lydians over the Amazons To avenge the ill-treatment received by this youth, Gygês attacked the territory of Magnêsia (probably Magnêsia on Sipylus), and after a considerable struggle took the city.[4]

Proceedings of Gygês.

How far the Lydian kingdom of Sardis extended during the reign of Gygês, we have no means of ascertaining. Strabo alleges that the whole Troad[5] belonged to him, and that the Greek settlement of Abydus on the Hellespont was established by the Milesians only under his auspices. On what authority this statement is made, we are not told, and it appears doubtful,

[1] Xanthi Fragment. 10, 12, 19, ed. Didot; Athenæ. x. p. 415; Nikolaus Damasc. p. 36, Orelli.

[2] Xanthi Fragm. 1, 2; Dionys. Halik. A. R. i. 28; Stephan. Byz. v. Τόρρηβος. The whole genealogy given by Dionysius is probably borrowed from Xanthus—Zeus, Manês, Kotys, Asiês and Atys, Lydus and Torrhêbus.

[3] Herod. i. 14; Pausan. ix. 29, 2.

[4] Nikolaus Damasc. p. 52, ed. Orelli.

[5] Strabo, xiii. p. 590.

especially as so many legendary anecdotes are connected with the name of Gygês. This prince reigned (according to Herodotus) thirty-eight years, and was succeeded by his son Ardys, who reigned forty-nine years (about B.C. 678—629). We learn that he attacked the Milesians, and took the Ionic city of Priênê. Yet this possession cannot have been maintained, for the city appears afterwards as autonomous.[1] His long reign, however, was signalised by two events, both of considerable moment to the Asiatic Greeks; the invasion of the Cimmerians, and the first approach to collison (at least the first of which we have any historical knowledge) between the inhabitants of Lydia and those of Upper Asia under the Median kings.

His son and successor Ardys.

It is affirmed by all authors that the Medes were originally numbered among the subjects of the great Assyrian empire, of which Nineveh (or Ninos as the Greeks call it) was the chief town, and Babylon one of the principal portions. That the population and power of these two great cities (as well as of several others which the Ten Thousand Greeks in their march found ruined and deserted in those same regions) is of high antiquity,[2] there is no room for doubting. But it is noway incumbent upon a historian of Greece to entangle himself in the mazes of Assyrian chronology, or to weigh the degree of credit to which the conflicting statements of Herodotus, Ktêsias, Berosus, Abydênus, &c., are entitled. With the Assyrian empire[3]—which lasted, according to Herodotus, 520 years, according to Ktêsias, 1360 years—the Greeks have no ascertainable connexion. The city of Nineveh appears to have been taken by the Medes a little before the year 600 B.C. (in so far as the chronology can be made out), and exercised no influence upon Grecian affairs. Those

Assyrians and Medes.

[1] Herodot. i. 15.

[2] Xenophôn, Anabas. iii. 4, 7; 10, 11.

[3] Herodot. i. 95; Ktêsias, Frag. Assyr. xiii. p. 419, ed. Bähr.; Diodor. ii. 21. Ktêsias gives 30 generations of Assyrian kings from Ninyas to Sardanapalus; Velleius, 33; Eusebius, 35; Syncellus, 40; Castor, 27; Cephalion, 23. See Bähr ad Ctesiam, p. 428. The Babylonian chronology of Berosus (a priest of Bêlus, about 280 B.C.) gave 86 kings and 34,000 years from the deluge to the Median occupation of Babylon; then 1453 years down to the reign of Phul king of Assyria (Berosi Fragmenta, p. 8, ed. Richter).

Mr. Clinton sets forth the chief statements and discrepancies respecting Assyrian chronology in his Appendix, c. 4. But the suppositions to which he resorts, in order to bring them into harmony, appear to me uncertified and gratuitous.

Compare the different, but not more successful track followed by Larcher (Chronologie, c. 3, p. 145—157).

inhabitants of Upper Asia, with whom the early Greeks had relation, were the Medes and the Assyrians or Chaldæans of Babylon—both originally subject to the Assyrians of Nineveh—both afterwards acquiring independence—and both ultimately embodied in the Persian empire. At what time either of them became first independent we do not know.[1] The astronomical

[1] Here again both Larcher and Mr. Clinton represent the time, at which the Medes made themselves independent of Assyria, as perfectly ascertained, though Larcher places it in 748 B.C., and Mr. Clinton in 711 B.C. "L'époque ne me paroît pas douteuse" (Chronologie, c. iv. p. 157), says Larcher. Mr. Clinton treats the epoch of 711 B.C. for this same event, as fixed upon "*the authority of Scripture*," and reasons upon it in more than one place as a fact altogether indisputable (Appendix, c. iii. p. 259): "We may collect from Scripture that the Medes did not become independent till after the death of Sennacherib; and accordingly Josephus (Ant. x. 2), having related the death of this king and the miraculous recovery of Hezekiah from sickness, adds—ἐν τοῦτῳ τῷ χρόνῳ συνέβη τὴν τῶν Ἀσσυρίων ἀρχὴν ὑπὸ Μήδων καταλυθῆναι. But the death of Sennacherib, as will be shown hereafter, is determined to the beginning of 711 B.C. The Median revolt, then, did not occur before B.C. 711; which refutes Conringius, who raises it to B.C. 715, and Valckenaer, who raises it to B.C. 741. Herodotus indeed implies an interval of some space between the revolt of the Medes and the election of Dêïokês to be king. But these anni ἀβασίλευτοι could not have been prior to the fifty-three years of Dêïokês, since the revolt is *limited by Scripture* to B.C. 711." Again, p. 261, he says, respecting the four Median kings mentioned by Eusebius before Dêïokês—"If they existed at all, they governed Media during the empire of the Assyrians, as we *know from Scripture*". And again, p. 280—"The precise date of the termination (of the Assyrian empire) in B.C. 711 is *given by Scripture*, with which Herodotus agrees," &c.

Mr. Clinton here treats, more than once, the revolt of the Medes as fixed to the year 711 B.C. *by Scripture*; but he produces no passage of Scripture to justify his allegation: and the passage which he cites from Josephus alludes, not to the Median revolt, but to the destruction of the Assyrian empire by the Medes. Herodotus represents the Medes as revolting from the Assyrian empire, and maintaining their independence for some time (undefined in extent) before the election of Dêïokês as king: but he gives us no means of determining the date of the *Median revolt*. When Mr. Clinton says (p. 280, Note O.)—"I suppose Herodotus to place the revolt of the Medes in Olymp. 17, 2, since he places the accession of Dêïokês in Olymp. 17, 3,"—this is a conjecture of his own: and the narrative of Herodotus seems plainly to imply that he conceived an interval far greater than one year between these two events. Diodôrus gives the same interval as lasting for many generations (Diod. ii. 32).

We know—both from Scripture and from the Phœnician annals, as cited by Josephus—that the Assyrians of Nineveh were powerful conquerors in Syria, Judæa, and Phœnicia, during the reigns of Salmaneser and Sennacherib. The statement of Josephus further implies that Media was subject to Salmaneser, who took the Israelites from their country into Media and Persis, and brought the Cuthæans out of Media and Persis into the lands of the Israelites (Joseph. ix. 14, 1; x. 9, 7). We know farther that after Sennacherib, the Assyrians of Nineveh are no more mentioned as invaders or disturbers of Syria or Judæa; the Chaldæans or Babylonians become then the enemies whom those countries have to dread. Josephus tells us, that at this epoch the Assyrian empire was destroyed by the Medes—or, as he says in another place, by the Medes and Babylonians (x. 2, 2; x. 5. 1). Here is good evidence for believing that the Assyrian empire of Nineveh sustained at this time a great shock and diminution of power. But as to the nature of this diminution, and the way in which it was brought about, it appears to me that there is a discrepancy of authorities which we have no means of reconciling—Josephus follows

canon, which gives a list of kings of Babylon beginning with what is called the æra of Nabonassar, or 747 B.C., does not prove at what epoch these Babylonian chiefs became independent of Nineveh: and the catalogue of Median kings, which Herodotus begins with Dêïokês, about 709—711 B.C., is commenced by Ktêsias more than a century earlier—moreover, the names in the two lists are different almost from first to last.

First Median king —Dêïokês.

For the historian of Greece, the Medes first begin to acquire importance about 656 B.C., under a king whom Herodotus calls Phraortês, son of Dêïokês. Respecting Dêïokês himself, Herodotus recounts to us how

the same view as Ktêsias, of the destruction of the empire of Nineveh by the Medes and Babylonians united, while Herodotus conceives successive revolts of the territories dependent upon Nineveh, beginning with that of the Medes, and still leaving Nineveh flourishing and powerful in its own territory. Herodotus further conceives Nineveh as taken by Kyaxarês the Mede, about the year 600 B.C., without any mention of Babylonians—on the contrary, in his representation, Nitokris the queen of Babylon is afraid of the Medes (i. 185), partly from the general increase of their power, but especially from their having taken Nineveh (though Mr. Clinton tells us, p. 275, that "Nineveh was destroyed B.C. 606, as we have seen from the united testimonies of the Scripture and Herodotus, *by the Medes and Babylonians*").

Construing fairly the text of Herodotus, it will appear that he conceived the relations of these oriental kingdoms between 800 and 560 B.C. differently on many material points from Ktêsias, or Berosus, or Josephus. And he himself expressly tells us, that he heard "four different tales" even respecting Cyrus (i. 95)—much more respecting events anterior to Cyrus by more than a century.

The chronology of the Medes, Babylonians, Lydians, and Greeks, in Asia, when we come to the seventh century B.C., acquires some fixed points which give us assurance of correctness within certain limits; but above the year 700 B.C. no such fixed points can be detected. We cannot discriminate the historical from the mythical in our authorities—we cannot reconcile them with each other, except by violent changes and conjectures—nor can we determine which of them ought to be set aside in favour of the other. The names and dates of the Babylonian kings down from Nabonassar, in the Canon of Ptolemy, are doubtless authentic, but they are names and dates only. When we come to apply them to illustrate real or supposed matters of fact, drawn from other sources, they only create a new embarrassment, for even the *names* of the kings as reported by different authors do not agree, and Mr. Clinton informs us (p. 277)—"In tracing the identity of Eastern kings, the times and the transactions are better guides than the names; for these, from many well-known causes (as the changes which they undergo in passing through the Greek language, and the substitution of a title or an epithet for the name), are variously reported, so that *the same king frequently appears under many different appellations*". Here then is a new problem: we are to employ "the times and transactions" to identify the kings; but unfortunately the *times* are marked only by the succession of kings, and the *transactions* are known only by statements always scanty and often irreconcilable with each other. So that our means of identifying the kings are altogether insufficient, and whoever will examine the process of identification as it appears in Mr. Clinton's chapters, will see that it is in a high degree arbitrary; more arbitrary still are the processes which he employs for bringing about a forced harmony between discrepant authorities. Nor is Volney (Chronologie d'Hérodote, vol. i. p. 383—429) more satisfactory in his chronological results.

he came to be first chosen king.[1] The seven tribes of Medes dwelt dispersed in separate villages, without any common authority, and the mischiefs of anarchy were painfully felt among them. Dêïokês, having acquired great reputation in his own village as a just man, was invoked gradually by all the adjoining villages to settle their disputes. As soon as his efficiency in this vocation, and the improvement which he brought about, had become felt throughout all the tribes, he artfully threw up his post and retired again into privacy,—upon which the evils of anarchy revived in a manner more intolerable than before. The Medes had now no choice except to elect a king. The friends of Dêïokês expatiated so warmly upon his virtues, that he was the person chosen.[2] The first step of the new king was to exact from the people a body of guards selected by himself; next, he commanded them to build the city of Ekbatana, upon a hill surrounded with seven concentric circles of walls, his own palace being at the top and in the innermost. He farther organised the scheme of Median despotism; the king, though his person was constantly secluded in a fortified palace, inviting written communications from all aggrieved persons, and administering to each the decision or the redress which they required—informing himself, moreover, of passing events by means of ubiquitous spies and officials, who seized all wrong-doers and brought them to the palace for condign punishment. Dêïokês farther constrained the Medes to abandon their separate abodes and concentrate themselves in Ekbatana, from whence all the powers of government branched out. And the seven distinct fortified circles in the town, coinciding as they do with the number of the Median tribes, were probably conceived by Herodotus as intended each for one distinct tribe—the tribe of Dêïokês occupying the innermost along with himself.[3]

Except the successive steps of this well-laid political plan, we hear of no other acts ascribed to Dêïokês. He is said to have held the government for fifty-three years, and then dying, was

[1] Herodot. i. 96—100.

[2] Herodot. i. 97. ὡς δ' ἐγὼ δοκέω, μάλιστα ἔλεγον οἱ τοῦ Δηϊόκεω φίλοι, &c.

[3] Herodot. i. 98, 99, 100. Οἰκοδομηθέντων δὲ πάντων, κόσμον τόνδε Δηϊόκης πρῶτός ἐστιν ὁ κατακτησάμενος· μήτε ἐσιέναι παρὰ βασιλέα μηδένα, δι' ἀγγελῶν δὲ πάντα χρέεσθαι, ὁρᾶσθαι δὲ βασιλέα ὑπὸ μηδενός· πρὸς δὲ τούτοισι ἔτι γελᾶν τε καὶ πτύειν ἄντιον, καὶ ἄπασι εἶναι τοῦτό γε αἰσχρόν, &c., and . . . οἱ κατάσκοποί τε καὶ κατήκοοι ἦσαν ἀνὰ πᾶσαν τὴν χώρην τῆς ἦρχε.

succeeded by his son Phraortês. Of the real history of Dêïokês, we cannot be said to know anything. For the interesting narrative of Herodotus, of which the above is an abridgment, presents to us in all its points Grecian society and ideas, not Oriental. It is like the discussion which the historian ascribes to the seven Persian conspirators, previous to the accession of Darius—whether they shall adopt an oligarchical, a democratical, or a monarchical form of government;[1] or it may be compared, perhaps more aptly still, to the Cyropædia of Xenophôn, who beautifully and elaborately works out an ideal such as Herodotus exhibits in brief outline. The story of Dêïokês describes what may be called the despot's progress, first as candidate and afterwards as fully established. Amidst the active political discussion carried on by intelligent Greeks in the days of Herodotus, there were doubtless many stories of the successful arts of ambitious despots, and much remark as to the probable means conducive to their success, of a nature similar to those in the Politics of Aristotle: one of these tales Herodotus has employed to decorate the birth and infancy of the Median monarchy. His Dêïokês begins like a clever Greek among other Greeks, equal, free, and disorderly. He is athirst for despotism from the beginning, and is forward in manifesting his rectitude and justice, "as beseems a candidate for command";[2] he passes into a despot by the public vote, and receives what to the Greeks was the great symbol and instrument of such transition, a personal body-guard; he ends by organising both the machinery and the etiquette of a despotism in the Oriental fashion, like the Cyrus of Xenophôn.[3] Only

His history composed of Grecian materials, not Oriental.

[1] Herodot. iii. 80—82. Herodotus, while he positively asserts the genuineness of these deliberations, lets drop the intimation that many of his contemporaries regarded them as of Grecian coinage.

[2] Herodot. i. 96. Ἐόντων δὲ αὐτονόμων πάντων ἀνὰ τὴν ἤπειρον, ὧδε αὖτις ἐς τυραννίδας περιῆλθον. Ἀνὴρ ἐν τοῖσι Μήδοισι ἐγένετο σοφὸς, τῷ οὔνομα ἦν Δηϊόκης . . . Οὗτος ὁ Δηϊόκης, ἐρασθεὶς τυραννίδος, ἐποίεε τοιάδε, &c. . . . Ὁ δὲ δὴ, οἷα μνεώμενος ἀρχὴν, ἰθύς τε καὶ δίκαιος ἦν.

[3] Compare the chapters above referred to in Herodotus with the eighth book of the Cyropædia, wherein Xenophôn describes the manner in which the Median despotism was put in effective order and turned to useful account by Cyrus, especially the arrangements for imposing on the imagination of his subjects (καταγοητεύειν, viii. 1, 40)—(it is a small thing, but marks the cognate plan of Herodotus and Xenophôn), Dêïokês forbids his subjects to laugh or spit in his presence. Cyrus also directs that no one shall spit, or wipe his nose, or turn round to look at any thing, when the king is present (Herodot. i. 99; Xen.

that both these authors maintain the superiority of their Grecian ideal over Oriental reality, by ascribing both to Dêïokês and Cyrus a just, systematic, and laborious administration, such as their own experience did not present to them in Asia. Probably Herodotus had visited Ekbatana (which he describes and measures like an eye-witness, comparing its circuit to that of Athens), and there heard that Dêïokês was the builder of the city, the earliest known Median king, and the first author of those public customs which struck him as peculiar, after a revolt from Assyria: the interval might then be easily filled up, between Median autonomy and Median despotism, by intermediate incidents such as would have accompanied that transition in the longitude of Greece. The features of these inhabitants of Upper Asia, for a thousand years forward from the time at which we are now arrived—under the descendants of Dêïokês, of Cyrus, of Arsakês, and of Ardshir—are so unvarying,[1] that we are much assisted in detecting those occasions in which Herodotus or others infuse into their history indigenous Grecian ideas.

Phraortês (658—636 B.C.), having extended the dominion of the Medes over a large portion of Upper Asia, and conquered both the Persians and several other nations, was ultimately defeated and slain in a war against the Assyrians of Nineveh; who, though deprived of their external dependencies, were yet brave and powerful by themselves. His son Kyaxares (636—595 B.C.) followed up with still greater energy the same plans of conquest, and is said to have been the first who introduced any organisation into the military force: before his time, archers, spearmen and cavalry, had been confounded together

Phraortês. —Kyaxarês.

Cyrop. viii. 1, 42). Again, viii. 3, 1, about the pompous procession of Cyrus when he rides out—*καὶ γὰρ αὐτῆς τῆς ἐξελάσεως ἡ σεμνότης ἡμῖν δοκεῖ μία τῶν τεχνῶν εἶναι τῶν μεμηχανημένων, τὴν ἀρχὴν μὴ εὐκαταφρόνητον εἶναι*—analogous to the Median Dêïokês in Herodotus—*Ταῦτα δὲ περὶ ἑωυτὸν ἐσέμνυνε τῶνδε εἵνεκεν*, &c. *Cyrus*—*ἐμφανίζων δὲ καὶ τοῦτο ὅτι περὶ πολλοῦ ἐποιεῖτο, μηδένα μήτε φίλον ἀδικεῖν μήτε σύμμαχον, ἀλλὰ τὸ δίκαιον ἰσχυρῶς ὁρῶν* (Cyrop. viii. 1, 26). *Dêïokês*—*ἦν τὸ δίκαιον φυλάσσων χαλεπός* (Herod. i. 100). *Cyrus* provides numerous persons who serve to him as eyes and ears throughout the country (Cyrop. viii. 2, 12). *Dêïokês* has many *κατάσκοποι* and *κατήνοοι* (Herodot. *ib.*).

[1] When the Roman emperor Claudius sends the young Parthian prince Meherdatês, who had been an hostage at Rome, to occupy the kingdom which the Parthian envoys tendered to him, he gives him some good advice, conceived in the school of Greek and Roman politics,—"Addidit præcepta, ut non dominationem ac servos, sed rectorem et cives, cogitaret: clementiamque ac justitiam, quanto ignara barbaris, tanto toleratiora, capesseret." (Tacit. Annal. xii. 11.)

indiscriminately, until this monarch established separate divisions for each. He extended the Median dominion to the eastern bank of the Halys, which river afterwards, by the conquests of the Lydian king Crœsus, became the boundary between the Lydian and Median empires: and he carried on war for six years with Alyattês king of Lydia, in consequence of the refusal of the latter to give up a band of Scythian Nomads, who, having quitted the territory of Kyaxarês in order to escape severities with which they were menaced, had sought refuge as suppliants in Lydia.[1] The war, indecisive as respects success, was brought to its close by a remarkable incident. In the midst of a battle between the Median and Lydian armies there happened a total eclipse of the sun, which occasioned equal alarm to both parties, and induced them immediately to cease hostilities.[2] The Kilikian prince Syennesis and the Babylonian prince Labynêtus interposed their mediation, and effected a reconciliation between Kyaxarês and Alyattês, one of the conditions of which was, that Alyattês gave his daughter Aryênis in marriage to Astyagês son of Kyaxarês. In this manner began the connexion between the Lydian and Median kings which afterwards proved so ruinous to Crœsus. It is affirmed that the Greek philosopher Thalês foretold this eclipse; but we may reasonably consider the supposed prediction as not less apocryphal than some others ascribed to him, and doubt whether at that time any living Greek possessed either knowledge or scientific capacity sufficient for such a calculation.[3]

[1] The passage of such Nomadic hordes from one government in the East to another, has been always, and is even down to the present day, a frequent cause of dispute between the different governments: they are valuable both as tributaries and as soldiers. The Turcoman Ilats (so these Nomadic tribes are now called) in the north-east of Persia frequently pass backwards and forwards, as their convenience suits, from the Persian territory to the Usbeks of Khiva and Bokhara: wars between Persia and Russia have been in like manner occasioned by the transit of the Ilats across the frontier from Persia into Georgia: so also the Kurd tribes near Mount Zagros have caused by their movements quarrels between the Persians and the Turks.

See Morier, Account of the Iliyats or Wandering Tribes of Persia, in the Journal of the Geographical Society of London, 1837, vol. vii. p. 240, and Carl Ritter, Erdkunde von Asien, West-Asien, Band ii. Abtheilung ii. Abschnitt ii. sect. 8, p. 387.

[2] Herodot, i. 74—103.

[3] Compare the analogous case of the prediction of the coming olive crop ascribed to Thalês (Aristot. Polit. i. 4. 5; Cicero De Divinat. i. 3). Anaxagoras is asserted to have predicted the fall of an aërolithe (Aristot. Meteorol. i. 7; Pliny, H. N. ii. 58; Plutarch, Lysand. c. 5).

Thalês is said by Herodotus to have predicted that the eclipse would take place "in the year in which it actually did occur"—a statement so vague that it strengthens the grounds of doubt.

The eclipse itself, and its terrific working upon the minds of the combatants, are facts not to be called in question; though the diversity of opinion among chronologists, respecting the date of it, is astonishing.[1]

The fondness of the Ionians for exhibiting the wisdom of their eminent philospher Thalês in conjunction with the history of the Lydian kings, may be seen further in the story of Thalês and Crœsus at the river Halys (Herod. i. 75)—a story which Herodotus himself disbelieves.

[1] Consult, for the chronological views of these events, Larcher ad Herodot. i. 74; Volney, Recherches sur l'Histoire Ancienne, vol. i. p. 330—355; Mr. Fynes Clinton, Fasti Hellenici, vol. i. p. 418 (Note ad B.C. 617, 2); Des Vignoles, Chronologie de l'Histoire Sainte, vol. ii. p. 245; Ideler, Handbuch der Chronologie, vol. i. p. 209.

No less than eight different dates have been assigned by different chronologists for this eclipse—the most ancient 625 B.C., the most recent 583 B.C. Volney is for 625 B.C.; Larcher for 597 B.C.; Des Vignoles for 585 B.C.; Mr. Clinton for 603 B.C. Volney observes, with justice, that the eclipse on this occasion "n'est pas l'accessoire, la broderie du fait, mais le *fait principal* lui-même" (p. 347): the astronomical calculations concerning the eclipse are therefore by far the most important items in the chronological reckoning of this event.

Three eminent astronomers, Francis Baily, Oltmanns, and Ideler, have fixed upon the eclipse of B.C. 610, September 30, as the only one fulfilling the conditions required by the narrative. Lastly, in the Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London for 1853, Professor Airy has inserted an elaborate Article "On the Eclipses of Agathoklês, Thalês, and Xerxês," pp. 179—200. That which he calls the "Eclipse of Thalês" (or said to have been predicted by Thalês), is the event now under discussion, described by Herodotus, i. 74. Although three such astronomers as Francis Baily, Oltmanns, and Ideler had agreed, after researches undertaken independently of each other, in fixing on the solar eclipse of 610 B.C. as the only one within possible limits of time, which would satisfy the conditions of Herodotus—yet Professor Airy has shown strong grounds for mistrusting the lunar data on which they all proceeded. He says, "I have examined every total eclipse in Oltmann's tables, extending from B.C. 631 to B.C. 585, and I *find only one* (namely, that of B.C. 585, May 28) which can have passed near to Asia Minor. That of B.C. 610, September 30, which was adopted by Baily and Oltmanns, *is now thrown north even of the Sea of Azof*" (p. 193). It is certain, as Professor Airy assumes, that the battle described by Herodotus must have taken place somewhere in Asia Minor.

Thus stands the case about the date of this eclipse as determined by high authority upon the most correct data yet attained.

One interesting sentence I transcribe from Professor Airy, because it tends to confirm the general fact stated by Herodotus, apart from the perplexities connected with the date of the eclipse. The Professor says, p. 180:—

"Mr. Baily in the first place pointed out that *only a total* eclipse could satisfy the account of Herodotus—and that a *total* eclipse *would* suffice. He lived to witness the total eclipse of 1842, but he observed it from the room of a house where probably he could scarcely remark the general effect of the eclipse. I have myself seen two total eclipses (those of 1842 and 1851), being on both occasions in the open country, and I can fully testify to the sudden and awful effect of a total eclipse. I have seen many large partial eclipses, and one annular eclipse concealed by clouds; and I believe that a large body of men, intent on military movements, would scarcely have remarked on these occasions anything unusual."

If the year 585 B.C. be recognised as the real date of the total eclipse to which Herodotus refers, we shall be forced to admit that Herodotus was mistaken in representing the battle to have taken place in the reign of Kyaxarês, who, as far as we can make out, died in 595 B.C. The battle must have taken place during the reign of Astyagês, son of Kyaxarês; and Cicero (de Divinat. i. 49) distinctly states that the eclipse did occur in the reign of Astyagês, while Pliny (H. N. ii. 12) also gives the date of the eclipse as Olymp. 48·4, or 585 B.C.

It was after this peace with Alyattês, as far as we can make out the series of events in Herodotus, that Kyaxarês collected all his forces and laid siege to Nineveh, but was obliged to desist by the unexpected inroad of the Scythians. Nearly at the same time, or somewhat before the time, that Upper Asia was desolated by these formidable Nomads, Asia Minor too was overrun by other Nomads—the Cimmerians —Ardys being then king of Lydia; and the two invasions, both spreading extreme disaster, are presented to us as indirectly connected together in the way of cause and effect.

Siege of Nineveh—invasion of the Scythians and Cimmerians.

The name Cimmerians appears in the Odyssey—the fable describes them as dwelling beyond the ocean-stream, immersed in darkness and unblest by the rays of Hêlios. Of this people as existent we can render no account, for they had passed away, or lost there identity and become subject, previous to the commencement of trustworthy authorities; but they seem to have been the chief occupants of the Tauric Chersonêsus (Crimea) and of the territory between that peninsula and the river Tyras (Dniester), at the time when the Greeks first commenced their permanent settlements on those coasts in the seventh century B.C. The numerous localities which bore their name, even in the time of Herodotus,[1] after they had ceased to exist as a nation—as well as the tombs of the Cimmerian kings then shown near the Tyras—sufficiently attest this fact. There is reason to believe that they were (like their conquerors and successors the Scythians) a nomadic people, mare-milkers, moving about with their tents and herds, suitably to the nature of those unbroken steppes which their territory presented, and which offered little except herbage in profusion. Strabo tells us[2] (on what authority we do not know) that they, as well as the Trêres and other Thracians, had desolated Asia Minor more than once before the time of Ardys, and even earlier than Homer.

The Cimmerians.

The Cimmerians thus belong partly to legend, partly to history; but the Scythians formed for several centuries an important section of the Grecian contem-

The Scythians.

[1] Herodot. iv. 11—12. Hekatæus also spoke of a town Κιμμερίς (Strabo, vii. p. 294).

Respecting the Cimmerians, consult Ukert, Skythien, p. 360 *seqq.*

[2] Strabo, i. pp. 6, 59, 61.

porary world. Their name, unnoticed by Homer, occurs for the first time in the Hesiodic poems. When the Homeric Zeus in the Iliad turns his eye away from Troy towards Thrace, he sees, besides the Thracians and Mysians, other tribes whose names cannot be made out, but whom the poet knows as milk-eaters and mare-milkers.[1] The same characteristic attributes, coupled with that of "having waggons for their dwelling-houses," appear in Hesiod connected with the name of the Scythians.[2] The navigation of the Greeks into the Euxine gradually became more and more frequent, and during the last half of the seventh century B.C. their first settlements on its coasts were established. The foundation of Byzantium, as well as of the Pontic Herakleia (at a short distance to the east of the Thracian Bosphorus) by the Megarians, is assigned to the thirtieth Olympiad, or 658 B.C.[3] The succession of colonies founded by the enterprise of Milesian citizens on the western coast of the Euxine seems to fall not very long after this date—at least within the following century. Istria, Tyras, and Olbia or Borysthenês, were planted respectively near the mouths of the three great rivers Danube, Dniester, and Bog: Kruni, Odêssus, Tomi, Kallatis, and Apollonia were also planted on the south-western or Thracian coast—northward of the dangerous land of Salmydêssus, so frequent in wrecks—yet south of the Danube.[4] According to the turn of Grecian religious faith, the colonists took out with them the worship of the hero Achilles (from whom perhaps the œkist and some of the expatriating chiefs professed to be descended), which they established with great solemnity both in the various towns and on the small adjoining islands. The earliest proof which we find of Scythia, as a territory familiar to Grecian ideas and feeling, is found in a fragment of the poet Alkæus (about B.C. 600), wherein

[1] Homer, Iliad, xiii. 4.—

. . . Αὐτὸς δὲ πάλιν τρέπεν ὄσσε φαεινὼ,
Νόσφιν ἐφ' ἱπποπόλων Θρηκῶν καθορώμενος αἶαν
Μυσῶν τ' ἀγχεμάχων, καὶ ἀγαυῶν Ἱππημολγῶν,
Γλακτοφάγων, Ἀβίων τε. δικαιοτάτων ἀνθρώπων.

Compare Strabo, xii. p. 553.

[2] Hesiod, Fragm. 63—64, Marktscheffel:—

Γλακτοφάγων εἰς αἶαν, ἀπήναις οἰκι' ἐχόντων . . .
Αἰθίοπας, Δίγυάς τε, ἰδὲ Σκύθας ἱππημολγούς.

Strabo, vii. p. 300—302.

[3] Raoul Rochette, Histoire des Colonies Grecques, tom. iii. ch. xiv. p. 297. The dates of these Grecian settlements near the Danube are very vague and untrustworthy.

[4] Skymnus Chius, v. 730, Fragm. 2—25.

he addresses Achilles[1] as "sovereign of Scythia". There were, besides, several other Milesian foundations on or near the Tauric Chersonese (Crimea) which brought the Greeks into conjunction with the Scythians — Herakleia, Chersonêsus, and Theodosia, on the southern coast and the south-western corner of the peninsula— Pantikapæum and the Teian colony of Phanagoria (these two on the European and Asiatic sides of the Cimmerian Bosphorus respectively), and Kêpi, Hermônassa, &c., not far from Phanagoria, on the Asiatic coast of the Euxine. Last of all, there was, even at the extremity of the Palus Mæôtis (Sea of Azof), the Grecian settlement of Tanais.[2] All or most of these seem to have been founded during the course of the sixth century B.C., though the precise dates of most of them cannot be named; probably several of them anterior to the time of the mystic poet Aristeas of Prokonnêsus, about 540 B.C. His long voyage from the Palus Mæôtis (Sea of Azof) into the interior of Asia as far as the country of the Issêdones (described in the poem, now lost, called the Arimaspian verses), implies an habitual intercourse between Scythians and Greeks which could not well have existed without Grecian establishments on the Cimmerian Bosphorus.

Grecian settlements on the coast of the Euxine.

Hekatæus of Milêtus[3] appears to have given much geographical information respecting the Scythian tribes. But Herodotus, who personally visited the town of Olbia, together with the inland regions adjoining to it, and

Scythia as described by Herodotus.

[1] Alkæus, Fragm. 49, Bergk; Eustath. ad Dionys. Perieg. 306—

Ἀχιλλεῦ, ὃ (γᾶς, Schneid.) Σκυθικὰς μέδεις.

Alkman, somewhat earlier, made mention of the Issêdones (Alkm. Frag. 129, Bergk; Steph. Byz. v. Ἰσσήδονες—he called them Assêdones) and of the Rhipæan mountains (Fr. 80).

In the old epic of Arktinus, the deceased Achilles is transported to an elysium in the λευκὴ νῆσος (see the argument of the Æthiopis in Düntzer's Collection of Epicc. Poet. Græc. p. 15), but it may reasonably be doubted whether λευκὴ νῆσος in his poem was anything but a fancy—not yet localised upon the little island off the mouth of the Danube.

For the early allusion to the Pontus Euxinus and its neighbouring inhabitants, found in the Greek poets, see Ukert, Skythien, pp. 15—18, 78; though he puts the Ionian colonies in the Pontus nearly a century too early, in my judgment.

[2] Compare Dr. Clarke's description of the present commerce between Taganrock (not far from the ancient Greek settlement of Tanais) and the Archipelago: besides exporting salt-fish, corn, leather, &c., in exchange for wines, fruit, &c., it is the great deposit of Siberian productions: from Orenburg it receives tallow, furs, iron, &c.; this is doubtless as old as Herodotus. (Clarke's Travels in Russia, ch. xv. p. 330.)

[3] Hekatæi Fragment., Fr. 153, 168, ed. Klausen. Hekatæus mentioned the Issêdones (Fr. 168; Steph. Byz. v. Ἰσσήδονες); both he and Damastês seem to have been familiar with the

probably other Grecian settlements in the Euxine (at a time which we may presume to have been about 450—440 B.C.)—and who conversed with both Scythians and Greeks competent to give him information—has left us far more valuable statements respecting the Scythian people, dominion, and manners, as they stood in his day. His conception of the Scythians, as well as that of Hippokratês, is precise and well-defined—very different from that of the later authors, who use the word almost indiscriminately to denote all barbarous Nomads. His territory called Scythia is a square area, twenty days' journey or 4000 stadia (somewhat less than 500 English miles) in each direction—bounded by the Danube (the course of which river he conceives in a direction from N.W. to S.E.), the Euxine, and the Palus Mæôtis, with the river Tanais, on three sides respectively—and on the fourth or north side by the nations called Agathyrsi, Neuri, Androphagi, and Melanchlæni.[1] However imperfect his idea of the figure of this territory may be found, if we compare it with a good modern map, the limits which he gives us are beyond all dispute: from the Lower Danube and the mountains eastward of Transylvania to the Lower Tanais, the whole area was either occupied by or subject to the Scythians. And this name comprised tribes differing materially in habits and civilization. The great mass of the people who bore it, strictly Nomadic in their habits—neither sowing nor planting, but living only on food derived from animals, especially mare's milk and cheese—moved from place to place, carrying their families in waggons

Tribes of Scythians.

poem of Aristeas: see Klausen, *ad loc.*; Steph. Byz. v. Ὑπερβόρειοι. Compare also Æschyl. Promēth. 409, 710, 805.

Hellanikus also seems to have spoken about Scythia in a manner generally conformable to Herodotus (Strabo, xii. p. 540). It does little credit to the discernment of Strabo that he treats with disdain the valuable Scythian chapter of Herodotus—ἄριστα Ἑλλάνικος καὶ Ἡρόδοτος καὶ Εὔδοξος κατεφλυάρησαν ἡμῶν (*ib.*).

[1] Herod. b. iv. 100—101. See, respecting the Scythia of Herodotus, the excellent dissertation of Niebuhr, contained in his Kleine Historische Schriften, "Ueber die Geschichte der Skythen, Geten, und Sarmaten," p. 360, alike instructive as to the geography and the history. Also the two chapters in Völcker's Mythische Geographie, ch. vii.—viii. sect. 23—26, respecting the geographical conceptions present to Herodotus in his description of Scythia.

Herodotus has much in his Scythian geography, however, which no comment can enable us to understand. Compared with his predecessors his geographical conceptions evince great improvement; but we shall have occasion, in the course of this history, to notice memorable examples of extreme misapprehension in regard to distance and bearings in these remote regions, common to him not only with his contemporaries, but also with his successors.

covered with wicker and leather, themselves always on horseback, with their flocks and herds, between the Borysthenês and the Palus Mæôtis. They hardly even reached so far westward as the Borysthenês, since a river (not easily identified) which Herodotus calls Pantikapês, flowing into the Borysthenês from the eastward, formed their boundary. These Nomads were the genuine Scythians, possessing the marked attributes of the race, and including among their number the Regal Scythians[1]—hordes so much more populous and more effective in war than the rest, as to maintain undisputed ascendency, and to account all other Scythians no better than their slaves. It was to these that the Scythian kings belonged, by whom the religious and political unity of the name was maintained—each horde having its separate chief and to a certain extent separate worship and customs. But besides these Nomads, there were also agricultural Scythians, with fixed abodes, living more or less upon bread, and raising corn for exportation, along the banks of the Borysthenês and the Hypanis.[2] And such had been the influence of the Grecian settlement of Olbia, at the mouth of the latter river, in creating

[1] Herod. iv. 17—21, 46—56; Hippokratês, De Aëre, Locis et Aquis, c. vi.; Æschyl. Prometh. 709; Justin, ii. 2.

It is unnecessary to multiply citations respecting Nomadic life, the same under such wide differences both of time and of latitude—the same with the "armentarius Afer" of Virgil (Georgic. iii. 343) and the "campestres Scythæ" of Horace (Ode iii. 24, 12), and the Tartars of the present day; see Dr. Clarke's Travels in Russia, ch. xiv. p. 310.

The fourth book of Herodotus, the Tristia and Epistolæ ex Ponto of Ovid, the Toxaris of Lucian (see c. 36, vol. i. p. 544 Hemst.), and the Inscription of Olbia (No. 2058 in Boeckh's Collection), convey a genuine picture of Scythian manners as seen by the near observer and resident—very different from the pleasing fancies of distant poets respecting the innocence of pastoral life. The poisoned arrows which Ovid so much complains of in the Sarmatians and Getæ (Trist. iii. 10, 60, among other passages, and Lucan, iii. 270), are not noticed by Herodotus in the Scythians.

The dominant Golden Horde among the Tartars, in the time of Zinghis Khan, has been often spoken of. Among the different Arab tribes now in Algeria, some are noble, others enslaved: the latter habitually, and by inheritance, servants of the former, following wherever ordered (Tableau de la Situation des Etablissemens Français en Algérie, p. 393, Paris, Mar. 1846).

[2] Ephorus placed the Karpidæ immediately north of the Danube (Fragm. 78, Marx; Skymn. Chius, 102). I agree with Niebuhr that this is probably an inaccurate reproduction of the Kallipidæ of Herodotus, though Boeckh is of different opinion (Introduct. ad Inscriptt. Sarmatic., Corpus Inscript. part xi. p. 81). The vague and dreamy statements of Ephorus, so far as we know them from the fragments, contrast unfavourably with the comparative precision of Herodotus. The latter expressly separates the Androphagi from the Scythians—*ἔθνος ἐὸν ἴδιον καὶ οὐδαμῶς Σκυθικόν* (iv. 18), whereas, when we compare Strabo, vii. p. 302 and Skymn. Chi. 105—115, we see that Ephorus talked of the Androphagi as a variety of Scythians—*ἔθνος ἀνδροφάγων Σκυθῶν*.

The valuable inscription from Olbia (Nr. 2058 Boeckh) recognises *Μιξέλληνες* near that town.

new tastes and habits, that two tribes on its western banks, the Kallipidæ and the Alazônes, had become completely accustomed both to tillage and to vegetable food, and had in other respects so much departed from their Scythian rudeness as to be called Hellenic-Scythians, many Greeks being seemingly domiciled among them. Northward of the Alazônes lay those called the agricultural Scythians, who sowed corn, not for food, but for sale.[1]

Manners and worship.

Such stationary cultivators were doubtless regarded by the predominant mass of the Scythians as degenerate brethren. Some historians even maintain that they belonged to a foreign race, standing to the Scythians merely in the relation of subjects[2]—an hypothesis contradicted implicitly, if not directly, by the words of Herodotus, and no way necessary in the present case. It is not from them however that Herodotus draws his vivid picture of the people, with their inhuman rites and repulsive personal features. It is the purely Nomadic Scythians whom he depicts, the earliest specimens of the Mongolian race (so it seems probable[3]) known to history, and

[1] Herod. iv. 17. We may illustrate this statement of Herodotus by an extract from Heber's journal as cited in Dr. Clarke's Travels, ch. xv. p. 337: —"The Nagay Tartars begin to the west of Marinopol: they cultivate a good deal of corn, yet they dislike bread as an article of food".

[2] Niebuhr (Dissertat. *ut sup.* p. 360), Boeckh (Introd. Inscript. *ut sup.* p. 110), and Ritter (Vorhalle der Geschichte, p. 316) advance this opinion. But we ought not on this occasion to depart from the authority of Herodotus, whose information respecting the people of Scythia, collected by himself on the spot, is one of the most instructive and precious portions of his whole work. He is very careful to distinguish what is Scythian from what is not. Those tribes which Niebuhr (contrary to the sentiment of Herodotus) imagines *not* to be Scythian, were the tribes nearest and best known to him; probably he had personally visited them, since we know that he went up the river Hypanis (Bog) as high as the Exampæus, four days' journey from the sea (iv. 52—81).

That some portions of the same ἔθνος should be ἀροτῆρες, and other portions νόμαδες, is far from being without parallel; such was the case with the Persians, for example (Herodot. i. 126), and with the Iberians between the Euxine and the Caspian (Strabo, xi. p. 500).

The Pontic Greeks confounded Agathyrsus, Gelônus, and Scythês in the same genealogy, as being three brethren, sons of Hêraklês by the μιξοπάρθενος Ἔχιδνα of the Hylæa (iv. 7—10). Herodotus is more precise: he distinguishes both the Agathyrsi and Gelôni from Scythians.

[3] Both Niebuhr and Boeckh account the ancient Scythians to be of Mongolian race (Niebuhr in the Dissertation above-mentioned, Untersuchungen über die Geschichte der Skythen, Geten und Sarmaten, among the Kleine Historische Schriften, p. 362; Boeckh, Corpus Inscriptt. Græcarum, Introductio ad Inscriptt. Sarmatic. part xi. p. 81). Paul Joseph Schafarik, in his elaborate examination of the ethnography of the ancient people described as inhabiting northern Europe and Asia, arrives at the same result (Slavische Alterthümer, Pag. 1843, vol. i. xiii. 6, p. 279).

A striking illustration of this analogy of race is noticed by Alexander von Humboldt, in speaking of the burial-place and the funeral obsequies of the Tartar Tchinghiz Khan:—

prototypes of the Huns and Bulgarians of later centuries. The Sword, in the literal sense of the word, was their chief god[1]—an iron scimitar solemnly elevated upon a wide and lofty platform, which was supported on masses of faggots piled underneath—to whom sheep, horses, and a portion of their prisoners taken in war were offered up in sacrifice. Herodotus treats this sword as the image of the god Arês, thus putting an Hellenic interpretation upon that which he describes literally as a barbaric rite. The scalps and the skins of slain enemies, and sometimes the skull formed into a drinking cup, constituted the decoration of a Scythian warrior. Whoever had not slain an enemy was excluded from participation in the annual festival and bowl of wine prepared by the chief of each separate horde. The ceremonies which took place during the sickness and funeral obsequies of the Scythian

"Les cruautés lors de la pompe funèbre des grands-khans ressemblent entièrement à celles que nous trouvons décrites par Hérodote (iv. 71) environ 1700 ans avant la mort de Tchinghiz, et 65° de longitude plus à l'ouest, chez les Scythes du Gerrhus et du Borysthène". (Humboldt, Asie Centrale, vol. i. p. 244.)

Nevertheless M. Humboldt dissents from the opinion of Niebuhr and Boeckh, and considers the Scythians of Herodotus to be of Indo-Germanic, not of Mongolian race: Klaproth seems to adopt the same view (see Humboldt, Asie Centrale, vol. i. p. 401, and his valuable work, Kosmos, p. 491, note 383). He assumes it as a certain fact, upon what evidence I do not distinctly see, that no tribe of Turk or Mongol race migrated westward out of Central Asia until considerably later than the time of Herodotus. To make out such a negative, seems to me impossible: and the marks of ethnographical analogy, so far as they go, decidedly favour the opinion of Niebuhr. Ukert also (Skythien, p. 266—280) controverts the opinion of Niebuhr.

At the same time it must be granted that these marks are not very conclusive, and that many Nomadic hordes, whom no one would refer to the same race, may yet have exhibited an analogy of manners and characteristics equal to that between the Scythians and Mongols.

The principle upon which the Indo-European family of the human race is defined and parted off, appears to me inapplicable to any particular case wherein the *language* of the people is unknown to us. The nations constituting that family have no other point of affinity except in the roots and structure of their language; on every other point there is the widest difference. To enable us to affirm that the Massagetæ, or the Scythians, or the Alani, belonged to the Indo-European family, it would be requisite that we should know something of their language. But the Scythian language may be said to be wholly unknown; and the very few words which are brought to our knowledge do not tend to aid the Indo-European hypothesis.

[1] See the story of the accidental discovery of this Scythian sword when lost, by Attila the chief of the Huns (Priscus ap. Jornandem de Rebus Geticis, c. 35, and in Eclog. Legation. p. 50).

Lucian in the Toxaris (c. 38, vol. ii. p. 546, Hemst.) notices the worship of the Akinakês or Scimitar by the Scythians in plain terms, without interposing the idea of the god Arês: compare Clemen. Alexand. Protrept. p. 25, Syl. Ammianus Marcellinus, in speaking of the Alani (xxxi. 2), as well as Pomponius Mela (ii. 1) and Solinus (c. 20), copy Herodotus. Ammianus is more literal in his description of the Sarmatian sword-worship (xvii. 12): "Eductisque mucronibus, quos pro numinibus colunt," &c.

kings (who were buried at Gerrhi at the extreme point to which navigation extended up the Borysthenês) partook of the same sanguinary disposition. It was the Scythian practice to put out the eyes of all their slaves. The awkwardness of the Scythian frame, often overloaded with fat, together with extreme dirt of body and absence of all discriminating feature between one man and another, complete the brutish portrait.[1] Mare's milk (with cheese made from it) seems to have been their chief luxury, and probably served the same purpose of procuring the intoxicating drink called *kumiss*, as at present among the Bashkirs and the Kalmucks.[2]

Scythians formidable from numbers and courage.

If the habits of the Scythians were such as to create in the near observer no other feeling than repugnance, their force at least inspired terror. They appeared in the eyes of Thucydidês so numerous and so formidable, that he pronounces them irresistible, if they could but unite, by any other nation within his knowledge. Herodotus, too, conceived the same idea of a race among whom every man was a warrior and a practised horse-bowman, and who were placed by their mode of life out of all reach of an enemy's attack.[3] Moreover, Herodotus does not speak meanly of their intelligence, contrasting them in favourable terms with the general stupidity of the other nations bordering on the Euxine. In this respect Thucydidês seems to differ from him.

On the east, the Scythians of the time of Herodotus were separated only by the river Tanais from the Sarmatians, who occupied the territory for several days' journey north-east of the Palus Mæôtis: on the south they were divided by the Danube from the section of Thracians called Getæ. Both these nations were Nomadic, analogous to the Scythians in habits, military

[1] Herodot. iv. 3—62, 71—75; Sophoklês, Œnomaus—ap. Athenæ. ix. p. 410; Hippokratês, De Aëre, Locis et Aquis, ch. vi. s. 91—99, &c.

It is seldom that we obtain, in reference to the modes of life of an ancient population, two such excellent witnesses as Herodotus and Hippokratês about the Scythians.

Hippokratês was accustomed to see the naked figure in its highest perfection at the Grecian games: hence perhaps he is led to dwell more emphatically on the corporeal defects of the Scythians.

[2] See Pallas, Reise durch Russland, and Dr. Clarke, Travels in Russia, ch. xii. p. 238.

[3] Thucyd. ii. 95; Herodot. ii. 46—47: his idea of the formidable power of the Scythians seems also to be implied in his expression (c. 81), καὶ ὀλίγους, ὡς Σκύθας εἶναι.

Herodotus holds the same language about the Thracians, however, as Thucydidês about the Scythians—irresistible, if they could but act with union (v. 3).

efficiency, and fierceness. Indeed Herodotus and Hippokratês distinctly intimate that the Sarmatians were nothing but a branch of Scythians,[1] speaking a Scythian dialect, and distinguished from their neighbours on the other side of the Tanais chiefly by this peculiarity—that the women among them were warriors hardly less daring and expert than the men. This attribute of Sarmatian women, as a matter of fact, is well attested—though Herodotus has thrown over it an air of suspicion not properly belonging to it, by his explanatory genealogical mythe, deducing the Sarmatians from a mixed breed between the Scythians and the Amazons.

Sarmatians.

The wide extent of steppe eastward and north-eastward of the Tanais, between the Ural mountains and the Caspian, and beyond the possessions of the Sarmatians, was traversed by Grecian traders, even to a good distance in the direction of the Altai mountains—the rich produce of gold, both in Altai and Ural, being the great temptation. First (according to Herodotus) came the indigenous Nomadic nation called Budini, who dwelt to the northward of the Sarmatians,[2]

Tribes east and north of the Palus Mæôtis.

[1] The testimony of Herodotus to this effect (iv. 110—117) seems clear and positive, especially as to the language. Hippokratês also calls the Sauromatæ ἔθνος Σκυθικόν (De Aëre, Locis et Aquis, c. vi. sect. 89, Petersen).

I cannot think that there is any sufficient ground for the marked ethnical distinction which several authors draw (contrary to Herodotus) between the Scythians and the Sarmatians. Boeckh considers the latter to be of Median or Persian origin, but to be also the progenitors of the modern Sclavonian family: "Sarmatæ, Slavorum haud dubie parentes" (Introduct. ad Inscr. Sarmatic., Corp. Insc., part xi. p. 83). Many other authors have shared this opinion, which identifies the Sarmatians with the Slavi; but Paul Joseph Schafarik (Slavische Alterthümer, vol. i. c. 16) has given powerful reasons against it.

Nevertheless Schafarik admits the Sarmatians to be of Median origin, and radically distinct from the Scythians. But the passages which are quoted to prove this point from Diodôrus (ii. 43), from Mela (i. 19), and from Pliny (H. N. vi. 7), appear to me of much less authority than the assertion of Herodotus. In none of these authors is there any trace of inquiries made in or near the actual spot from neighbours and competent informants, such as we find in Herodotus. And the chapter in Diodôrus, on which both Boeckh and Schafarik lay especial stress, is one of the least trustworthy in the whole book. To believe in the existence of Scythian kings who reigned over all Asia from the Eastern Ocean to the Caspian, and sent out large colonies of Medians and Assyrians, is surely impossible; and Wesseling speaks much within the truth when he says, "Verum hæc dubia admodum atque incerta". It is remarkable to see Boeckh treating this passage as conclusive against Herodotus and Hippokratês. M. Boeckh has also given a copious analysis of the names found in the Greek inscriptions from Scythian, Sarmatian, and Mæotic localities (Introduct. ad Inscripp. Sarmatic.), and he endeavours to establish an analogy between the two latter classes and Median names. But the analogy holds just as much with regard to the Scythian names.

[2] The locality which Herodotus assigns to the Budini creates difficulty. According to his own statement, it would seem that they ought to be near to the Neuri (iv. 105), and so in fact

and among whom were established a colony of Pontic Greeks intermixed with natives and called Gelôni: these latter inhabited a spacious town, built entirely of wood. Beyond the Budini eastward dwelt the Thyssagetæ and the Jurkæ, tribes of hunters, and even a body of Scythians who had migrated from the territories of the Regal Scythians. The Issêdones were the easternmost people respecting whom any definite information reached the Greeks; beyond them we find nothing but fable[1]—the one-eyed Arimaspians, the gold-guarding Grypes or Griffins, and the bald-headed Argippæi. It is impossible to fix with precision the geography of these different tribes, or to do more than comprehend approximately their local bearings and relations to each other.

But the best known of all is the situation of the Tauri

Ptolemy places them (v. 9) near about Volhynia and the sources of the Dniester.

Mannert (Geographie der Griech. und Römer, Der Norden der Erde, v. iv. p. 138) conceives the Budini to be a Teutonic tribe; but Paul Joseph Schafarik (Slavische Alterthümer, i. 10, p. 185—195) has shown more plausible grounds for believing both them and the Neuri to be of Slavic family. It seems that the names Budini and Neuri are traceable to Slavic roots; that the wooden town described by Herodotus in the midst of the Budini is an exact parallel of the primitive Slavic towns, down even to the twelfth century; and that the description of the country around, with its woods and marshes containing beavers, otters, &c., harmonises better with Southern Poland and Russia than with the neighbourhood of the Ural mountains. From the colour ascribed to the Budini, no certain inference can be drawn: γλαυκόν τε πᾶν ἰσχυρῶς ἐστι καὶ πυῤῥόν (iv. 108). Mannert construes it in favour of Teutonic family, Schafarik in favour of Slavic; and it is to be remarked, that Hippokratês talks of the Scythians generally as extremely πυῤῥοί (De Aëre, Locis et Aquis, c. vi.: compare Aristot. Problem. xxxviii. 2).

These reasonings are plausible; yet we can hardly venture to alter the position of the Budini as Herodotus describes it, eastward of the Tanais. For he states in the most explicit manner that the route as far as the Argippæi *is thoroughly known*, traversed both by Scythian and by Grecian traders, and that all the nations in the way to it are known (iv. 24): μέχρι μὲν τούτων πολλὴ περιφάνεια τῆς χώρης ἐστὶ καὶ τῶν ἔμπροσθεν ἐθνέων· καὶ γὰρ Σκυθέων τινὲς ἀπικνέονται ἐς αὐτούς, τῶν οὐ χαλεπόν ἐστι πυθέσθαι, καὶ Ἑλλήνων τῶν ἐκ Βορυσθενέος τε ἐμπορίου, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων Ποντικῶν ἐμπορίων. These Greek and Scythian traders, in their journey from the Pontic seaports into the interior, employed seven different languages and as many interpreters.

Völcker thinks that Herodotus or his informants confounded the Don with the Volga (Mythische Geographie, sect. 24, p. 190), supposing that the higher parts of the latter belonged to the former: a mistake not unnatural, since the two rivers approach pretty near to each other at one particular point, and since the lower parts of the Volga, together with the northern shore of the Caspian, where its embouchure is situated, appear to have been little visited and almost unknown in antiquity. There cannot be a more striking evidence how unknown these regions were, than the persuasion, so general in antiquity, that the Caspian Sea was a gulf of the ocean, to which Herodotus, Aristotle, and Ptolemy are almost the only exceptions. Alexander von Humboldt has some valuable remarks on the tract laid down by Herodotus from the Tanais to the Argippæi (Asie Centrale, vol. i. p. 390—400).

[1] Herodot. iv. 80.

(perhaps a remnant of the expelled Cimmerians), who dwelt in the southern portion of the Tauric Chersonêsus (or Crimea), and who immolated human sacrifices to their native virgin goddess—identified by the Greeks with Artemis, and serving as a basis for the affecting legend of Iphigeneia. The Tauri are distinguished by Herodotus from Scythians,[1] but their manners and state of civilization seem to have been very analogous. It appears also that the powerful and numerous Massagetæ, who dwelt in Asia on the plains eastward of the Caspian and southward of the Issêdones, were so analogous to the Scythians as to be reckoned as members of the same race by many of the contemporaries of Herodotus.[2]

Tauri in the Crimea—Massagetæ.

This short enumeration of the various tribes near the Euxine and the Caspian, as well as we can make them out, from the seventh to the fifth century B.C., is necessary for the comprehension of that double invasion of Scythians and Cimmerians which laid waste Asia between 630 and 610 B.C. We are not to expect from Herodotus, born a century and a half afterwards, any very clear explanations of this event, nor were all his informants unanimous respecting the causes which brought it about. But it is a fact perfectly within the range of historical analogy, that accidental aggregations of number, development of aggressive spirit, or failure in the means of subsistence, among the Nomadic tribes of the Asiatic plains, have brought on the civilised nations of Southern Europe calamitous invasions of which the primary moving cause was remote and unknown. Sometimes a weaker tribe, flying before a stronger, has been in this manner precipitated upon the territory of a richer and less military population, so that an impulse originating in the distant plains of Central Tartary has been propagated until it reached the southern extremity of Europe, through successive intermediate tribes—a phænomenon especially exhibited during the fourth and fifth centuries of the Christian æra, in the declining years of the Roman empire. A pressure so

Invasion of Asia by Scythians and Cimmerians.

[1] Herodot. iv. 99—101. Dionysius Periêgêtês seems to identify Cimmerians and Tauri (v. 168: compare v. 680, where the Cimmerians are placed on the Asiatic side of the Cimmerian Bosphorus, adjacent to the Sindi).

[2] Herodot. i. 202. Strabo compares the inroads of the Sakæ, which was the name applied by the Persians to the Scythians, to those of the Cimmerians and the Trêres (xi. p. 511—512).

transmitted onward is said to have brought down the Cimmerians and Scythians upon the more southerly regions of Asia. The most ancient story in explanation of this incident seems to have been contained in the epic poem (now lost) called *Arimaspia*, of the mystic Aristeas of Prokonnêsus, composed apparently about 540 B.C. This poet, under the inspiration of Apollo,[1] undertook a pilgrimage to visit the sacred Hyperboreans (especial votaries of that god) in their elysium beyond the Rhipæan mountains; but he did not reach farther than the Issêdones. According to him, the movement, whereby the Cimmerians had been expelled from their possessions on the Euxine Sea, began with the Grypes or Griffins in the extreme north—the sacred character of the Hyperboreans beyond was incompatible with aggression or bloodshed. The Grypes invaded the Arimaspians, who on their part assailed their neighbours the Issêdones.[2] These latter moved southward or westward and drove the Scythians across the Tanais; while the Scythians, carried forward by this onset, expelled the Cimmerians from their territories along the Palus Mæôtis and the Euxine.

Cimmerians driven out of their country by the Scythians.

We see thus that Aristeas referred the attack of the Scythians upon the Cimmerians to a distant impulse proceeding in the first instance from the Grypes or Griffins. But Herodotus had heard it explained in another way which he seems to think more correct—the Scythians, originally occupants of Asia, or the regions east of the Caspian, had been driven across the Araxês, in consequence of an unsuccessful war with the Massagetæ, and precipitated upon the Cimmerians in Europe.[3]

When the Scythian host approached, the Cimmerians were not agreed among themselves whether to resist or retire. The majority of the people were dismayed and wished to evacuate the territory, while the kings of the different tribes resolved to fight and perish at home. Those who were animated with such fierce despair divided themselves along with the kings into two equal bodies, and perished by each other's hands near the river Tyras, where the sepulchres of the kings were yet shown in the time of

[1] Herodot. iv. 13. φοιβολαμπτὸς γενόμενος.
[2] Herodot. iv. 13.
[3] Herodot. iv. 11. Ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἄλλος λόγος, ἔχων ὧδε, τῷ μάλιστα λεγομένῳ αὐτὸς προσκείμαι.

Herodotus.[1] The mass of the Cimmerians fled and abandoned their country to the Scythians; who, however, not content with the possession of the country, followed the fugitives across the Cimmerian Bosphorus from west to east, under the command of their prince Madyês son of Protothyês. The Cimmerians, coasting along the east of the Euxine Sea and passing to the west of Mount Caucasus, made their way first into Kolchis, and next into Asia Minor, where they established themselves on the peninsula on the northern coast, near the site of the subsequent Grecian city of Sinôpê. But the Scythian pursuers, mistaking the course taken by the fugitives, followed the more circuitous route east of Mount Caucasus near to the Caspian Sea;[2] which brought them, not into Asia Minor, but into Media. Both Asia Minor and Media became thus exposed nearly at the same time to the ravages of northern Nomads.

These two stories, representing the belief of Herodotus and Aristeas, involve the assumption that the Scythians were comparatively recent immigrants into the territory between the Ister and the Palus Mæôtis. But the legends of the Scythians themselves, as well as those of the Pontic Greeks, imply the contrary of this assumption; and describe the Scythians as primitive and indigenous inhabitants of the country. Both legends are so framed as to explain a triple division, which probably may have prevailed, of the Scythian aggregate nationality, traced up to three heroic brothers: both also agree in awarding the predominance to the youngest brother of the three,[3] though, in other respects, the names and incidents of the two are altogether different. The Scythians called themselves Skoloti.

Such material differences, in the various accounts given to Herodotus of the Scythian and Cimmerian invasions of Asia, are by no means wonderful, seeing that nearly two centuries had elapsed between that event and his visit to the Pontus. That the Cimmerians (perhaps

Difficulties in the narrative of Herodotus.

[1] Herodot. iv. 11.

[2] Herodot. iv. 1—12.

[3] Herodot. iv. 5—9. At this day, the three great tribes of the Nomadic Turcomans on the north-eastern border of Persia near the Oxus—the Yamud, the Gokla, and the Tuka—assert for themselves a legendary genealogy deduced from three brothers (Frazer, Narrative of a Journey in Khorasan, p. 258).

the northernmost portion of the great Thracian name and conterminous with the Getæ on the Danube) were the previous tenants of much of the territory between the Ister and the Palus Mæôtis, and that they were expelled in the seventh century B.C. by the Scythians, we may follow Herodotus in believing. But Niebuhr has shown that there is great intrinsic improbability in his narrative of the march of the Cimmerians into Asia Minor, and in the pursuit of these fugitives by the Scythians. That the latter would pursue at all, when an extensive territory was abandoned to them without resistance, is hardly supposable: that they would pursue and mistake their way, is still more difficult to believe: nor can we overlook the great difficulties of the road and the Caucasian passes, in the route ascribed to the Cimmerians.[1] Niebuhr supposes the latter to have marched into Asia Minor by the western side of the Euxine and across the Thracian Bosphorus, after having been defeated in a decisive battle by the Scythians near the river Tyras, where their last kings fell and were interred.[2] Though this is both an easier route, and more in accordance with the analogy of other occupants expelled from the same territory, we must, in the absence of positive evidence, treat the point as unauthenticated.

The inroad of the Cimmerians into Asia Minor was doubtless connected with their expulsion from the northern coast of the Euxine by the Scythians, but we may well doubt whether it was at all connected (as Herodotus had been told that it was) with the invasion of Media by the Scythians, except as happening near

[1] Read the description of the difficult escape of Mithridates Eupator, with a mere handful of men, from Pontus to Bosphorus by this route, between the western edge of Caucasus and the Euxine (Strabo, xi. p. 495—496)—ἡ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν καὶ Ζυγῶν καὶ Ἡνιόχων παραλία—all piratical and barbarous tribes—τῇ παραλίᾳ χαλεπὸς ἦει, τὰ πολλὰ ἐμβαίνων ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν: compare Plutarch, Pompeius, c. 34. Pompey thought the route unfit for his march.

To suppose the Cimmerian tribes with their waggons passing along such a track would require strong positive evidence. According to Ptolemy, however, there were two passes over the range of Caucasus—the Caucasian or Albanian gates, near Derbend and the Caspian, and the Sarmatian gates, considerably more to the westward (Ptolemy, Geogr. v. 9; Forbiger, Handbuch der Alten Geographie, vol. ii. sect. 56, p. 55). It is not impossible that the Cimmerians may have followed the westernmost, and the Scythians the easternmost, of these two passes; but the whole story is certainly very improbable.

[2] See Niebuhr's Dissertation above referred to, p. 366—367. A reason for supposing that the Cimmerians came into Asia Minor from the west and not from the east is, that we find them so much confounded with the Thracian Trêres, indicating seemingly a joint invasion.

about the same time. The same great evolution of Scythian power, or propulsion by other tribes behind, may have occasioned both events,—brought about by different bodies of Scythians, but nearly contemporaneous.

Cimmerians in Asia Minor.

Herodotus tells us two facts respecting the Cimmerian immigrants into Asia Minor. They committed destructive, though transient, ravages in many parts of Paphlagonia, Phrygia, Lydia, and Ionia—and they occupied permanently the northern peninsula,[1] whereon the Greek city of Sinôpê was afterwards planted. Had the elegies of the contemporary Ephesian poet Kallinus been preserved, we should have known better how to appreciate these trying times. He strove to keep alive the energy of his countrymen against the formidable invaders.[2] From later authors (who probably had

[1] Herodot. i. 6—15; iv. 12. φαίνονται δὲ οἱ Κιμμέριοι, φεύγοντες ἐς τὴν Ἀσίην τοὺς Σκύθας, καὶ τὴν Χερσόνησον κτίσαντες, ἐν τῇ νῦν Σινώπη πόλις Ἑλλὰς οἰκίσται.

[2] Kallinus, Fragment. 2, 3, ed. Bergk. Νῦν δ' ἐπὶ Κιμμερίων στρατὸς ἔρχεται ὀβριμοέργων (Strabo, xiii. p. 627: xiv. 633—647). O. Müller (History of the Literature of Ancient Greece, ch. x. s. 4) and Mr. Clinton (Fasti Hellenici, B.C. 716—635) may be consulted about the obscure chronology of these events. The Scythico-Cimmerian invasion of Asia, to which *Herodotus* alludes, appears fixed for some date in the reign of Ardys the Lydian, 640—629 B.C., and may stand for 635 B.C., as Mr. Clinton puts it. O. Müller is right, I think, in stating that the fragment of the poet Kallinus above cited alludes to *this* invasion; for the supposition of Mr. Clinton that Kallinus here alludes to an invasion past and not present, appears to be excluded by the word *νῦν*. Mr. Clinton places both Kallinus and Archilochus (in my judgment) half a century too high; for I agree with O. Müller in disbelieving the story told by Pliny of the picture sold by Bularchus to Kandaulês. O. Müller follows Strabo (i. p. 61) in calling Madys a Cimmerian prince who drove the Trêres out of Asia Minor; whereas Herodotus mentions him as the *Scythian* prince who drove the Cimmerians *out* of their own territory *into* Asia Minor (i. 103).

The chronology of Herodotus is intelligible and consistent with itself: that of Strabo we cannot settle, when he speaks of many different invasions. Nor does his language give us the smallest reason to suppose that he was in possession of any means of determining dates for these early times—nothing at all calculated to justify the positive chronology which Mr. Clinton deduces from him: compare Fasti Hellenici, B.C. 635, 629, 617. Strabo says, after affirming that Homer knew both the name and the reality of the Cimmerians (i. p. 6; iii. p. 149)—καὶ γὰρ καθ' Ὅμηρον, ἢ πρὸ αὐτοῦ μικρὸν, λέγουσι τὴν τῶν Κιμμερίων ἔφοδον γενέσθαι τὴν μέχρι τῆς Αἰολίδος καὶ τῆς Ἰωνίας—"which places the first appearance of the Cimmerians in Asia Minor a century *at least* before the Olympiad of Corœbus" (says Mr. Clinton). But what means could Strabo have had to chronologise events as happening *at or a little before* the time of Homer? No date in the Grecian world was so contested, or so indeterminable, as the time of Homer: nor will it do to reason, as Mr. Clinton does, *i.e.* to take the latest date fixed for Homer among many, and then to say that the invasion of the Cimmerians *must* be *at least* B.C. 876: thus assuming it as a certainty that whether the date of Homer be a century earlier or later, the invasion of the Cimmerians must be made to fit it. When Strabo employs such untrustworthy chronological standards, he only shows us (what everything else confirms) that there existed no tests of any value for events of that early date in the Grecian world.

these poems before them) we learn that the Cimmerian host, having occupied the Lydian chief town Sardis (its inaccessible acropolis defied them), poured with their waggons into the fertile valley of the Kaïster, took and sacked Magnêsia on the Mæander, and even threatened the temple of Artemis at Ephesus. But the goddess so well protected her own town and sanctuary,[1] that

Mr. Clinton announces this ante-Homeric calculation as a chronological certainty: "The Cimmerians first appeared in Asia Minor about a century before B.C. 776. An irruption is *recorded* in B.C. 782. Their last inroad was in B.C. 635. The settlement of Ambrôn (the Milesian, at Sinôpê) may be placed at about B.C. 782, twenty-six years before the æra assigned to (the Milesian or Sinôpic settlement of) Trapezus."

On what authority does Mr. Clinton assert that a Cimmerian irruption was *recorded* in B.C. 782? Simply on the following passage of Orosius, which he cites at B.C. 635:—"Anno ante urbem conditam tricesimo—Tunc etiam *Amazonum gentis et Cimmeriorum* in Asiam repentinus incursus plurimum diu lateque vastationem et stragem intulit". If this authority of Orosius is to be trusted, we ought to say that the invasion of the Amazons was a *recorded* fact. To treat a fact mentioned in Orosius (an author of the fourth century after Christ) and referred to B.C. 782, as a *recorded* fact, confounds the most important boundary-lines in regard to the appreciation of historical evidence.

In fixing the Cimmerian invasion of Asia at 782 B.C., Mr. Clinton has the statement of Orosius, whatever it may be worth, to rest upon; but in fixing the settlement of Ambrôn the Milesian (at Sinôpê) at 782 B.C., I know not that he had any authority at all. Eusebius does indeed place the foundation of Trapezus in 756 B.C., and Trapezus is said to have been a colony from Sinôpê; and Mr. Clinton therefore is anxious to find some date for the foundation of Sinôpê anterior to 756 B.C.; but there is nothing to warrant him in selecting 782 B.C., rather than any other year.

In my judgment, the establishment of *any* Milesian colony in the Euxine at so early a date as 756 B.C. is highly improbable: and when we find that the same Eusebius fixes the foundation of Sinôpê (the metropolis of Trapezus) as low down as 629 B.C., this is an argument with me for believing that the date which he assigns to Trapezus is by far too early. Mr. Clinton treats the date which Eusebius assigns to Trapezus as certain, and infers from it that the date which the same author assigns to *Sinôpê* is 130 years *later* than the reality: I reverse the inference, considering the date which he assigns to *Sinôpê* as the more trustworthy of the two, and deducing the conclusion, that the date which he gives for *Trapezus* is 130 years at least *earlier* than the reality.

On all grounds, the authority of the chronologists is greater with regard to the later of the two periods than to the earlier, and there is besides the additional probability arising out of what is a suitable date for Milesian settlement. To which I will add, that Herodotus places the settlement of the Cimmerians near "that spot where Sinôpê is *now* settled," in the reign of Ardys, soon after 635 B.C. Sinôpê was therefore *not* founded at the time when the Cimmerians went there, in the belief of Herodotus.

[1] Strabo, i. p. 61; Kallimachus, Hymn. ad Dianam, 251—260—

. . . ἠλαίνων ἀλαπάζεμεν ἠπείλησε (Ἔφεσον)
Λύγδαμις ὑβριστὴς, ἐπὶ δὲ στρατὸν ἱππημολγων
Ἤγαγε Κιμμερίων, ψαμάθῳ ἴσον, οἵ ῥα παρ' αὐτὸν
Κεκλίμενοι ναίουσι βοὸς πόρον Ἰναχιώνης.
Ἀ δειλὸς βασιλέων ὅσον ἤλιτεν· οὐ γὰρ ἔμελλε
Οὔτ' αὐτὸς Σκυθίηνδε παλίμπετες, οὔτε τις ἄλλος
Ὅσσων ἐν λειμῶνι Καϋστρίῳ ἦσαν ἄμαξαι,
Ἀψ ἀπονοστήσειν. . . .

In the explanation of the proverb Σκυθῶν ἐρημία, allusion is made to a sudden panic and flight of *Scythians* from Ephesus (Hesychius, v. Σκυθῶν ἐρημία)—probably this must refer to some story of interference on the part of Artemis to protect the town against these Cimmerians. The confusion

Lygdamis the leader of the Cimmerians, whose name marks him for a Greek, after a season of prosperous depredation in Lydia and Ionia, conducting his host into the mountainous regions of Kilikia, was there overwhelmed and slain. Though these marauders perished, the Cimmerian settlers in the territory near Sinôpê remained: and Ambrôn, the first Milesian œkist who tried to colonise that spot, was slain by them, if we may believe Skymnus. They are not mentioned afterwards, but it seems not unreasonable to believe that they appear under the name of the Chalybes, whom Herodotus mentions along that coast between the Mariandynians and Paphlagonians, and whom Mela notices as adjacent to Sinôpê and Amisus.[1] Other authors place the Chalybes, on several different points, more to the east, though along the same parallel of latitude—between the Mosynœki and Tibarêni—near the river Thermôdôn—and on the northern boundary of Armenia, near the sources of the Araxês; but Herodotus and Mela recognise Chalybes westward of the river Halys and the Paphlagonians, near to Sinôpê. These Chalybes were brave mountaineers, though savage in manners; distinguished as producers and workers of the iron which their mountains afforded. In the conceptions of the Greeks, as manifested in a variety of fabulous notices, they are plainly connected with Scythians or Cimmerians; whence it seems probable that this connexion was present to the mind of Herodotus in regard to the inland population near Sinôpê.[2]

between Cimmerians and Scythians is very frequent.

[1] Herodot. i. 28; Mela, i. 19, 9; Skymn. Chi. Fragm. 207.

[2] The ten thousand Greeks in their homeward march passed through a people called Chalybes between Armenia and the town of Trapezus, and also again after eight days' march westerly from Trapezus, between the Tibarêni and Mosynœki: compare Xenophôn, Anabas. iv. 7, 15; v. 5, 1; probably different sections of the same people. The last-mentioned Chalybes seem to have been the best known, from their iron works, and their greater vicinity to the Greek ports: Ephorus recognised them (see Ephori Fragm. 80—82, ed. Marx); whether he knew of the more easterly Chalybes, north of Armenia, is less certain: so also Dionysius Periêgêtês, v. 768; compare Eustathius *ad loc.*

The idea which prevailed among ancient writers, of a connexion between the Chalybes in these regions and the Scythians or Cimmerians (Χάλυβες Σκυθῶν ἄποικος, Æschyl. Sept. adv. Thebas, 729; and Hesiod. ap. Clemen. Alex. Str. i. p. 132), and of which the supposed residence of the Amazons on the river Thermôdôn seems to be one of the manifestations, is discussed in Hoeck, Kreta, book i. p. 294—305; and Mannert, Geographie der Griechen und Römer, vi. 2, p. 408—416: compare Stephan. Byz. v. Χάλυβες. Mannert believes in an early Scythian immigration into these regions. The Ten Thousand Greeks passed through the territory of a people called Skythini, immediately bordering on the

Herodotus seems to have conceived only one invasion of Asia by the Cimmerians, during the reign of Ardys in Lydia. Ardys was succeeded by his son Sadyattês, who reigned twelve years; and it was Alyattês, son and successor of Sadyattês (according to Herodotus), who expelled the Cimmerians from Asia.[1] But Strabo seems to speak of several invasions, in which the Trêres, a Thracian tribe, were concerned, and which are not clearly discriminated; while Kallisthenês affirmed that Sardis had been taken by the Trêres and Lykians. We see only that a large and fair portion of Asia Minor was for much of this seventh century B.C. in possession of these destroying Nomads, who while on the one hand they afflicted the Ionic Greeks, on the other hand indirectly befriended them by retarding the growth of the Lydian monarchy.

Scythians in Upper Asia.

The invasion of Upper Asia by the Scythians appears to have been nearly simultaneous with that of Asia Minor by the Cimmerians, but more ruinous and longer protracted. The Median king Kyaxarês, called away from the siege of Nineveh to oppose them, was totally defeated; and the Scythians became full masters of the country. They spread themselves over the whole of Upper Asia, as far as Palestine and the borders of Egypt, where Psammetichus the Egyptian king met them and only redeemed his kingdom from invasion by prayers and costly presents. In their return a detachment of them sacked the temple of Aphroditê at Askalon; an act of sacrilege which the goddess avenged both upon the plunderers and their descendants, to the third and fourth generation. Twenty-eight years did their dominion in Upper Asia continue,[3] with intolerable cruelty and oppression; until at length Kyaxarês and the Medes found means to entrap the

Chalybes to the north; which region some identify with the Sakasênê of Strabo (xi. 511) occupied (according to that geographer) by invaders from Eastern Scythia.

It seems that Sinôpê was one of the most considerable places for the export of the iron used in Greece; the Sinôpic as well as the Chalybdic (or Chalybic) iron had a special reputation (Stephan. Byz. v. Λακεδαίμων).

About the Chalybes, compare Ukert, Skythien, p. 521—523.

[1] Herodot. i. 15, 16.

[2] Strabo, xi. p. 511: xii. p. 552; xiii. p. 627.

The poet Kallinus mentioned both Cimmerians and Trêres (Fr. 2, 3, ed. Bergk; Strabo, xiv. p. 633—647).

[3] Herodot. i. 105. The account given by Herodotus of the punishment inflicted by the offended Aphroditê on the Scythian plunderers, and on their children's children down to his time, becomes especially interesting when

chiefs into a banquet, and slew them in the hour of intoxication. The Scythian host once expelled, the Medes resumed their empire. Herodotus tells us that these Scythians returned to the Tauric Chersonese, where they found that during their long absence, their wives had intermarried with the slaves, while the new offspring which had grown up refused to readmit them. A deep trench had been drawn across a line over which their march lay,[1] and the new-grown youth defended it with bravery, until at length (so the story runs) the returning masters took up their whips instead of arms, and scourged the rebellious slaves into submission.

Little as we know about the particulars of these Cimmerian and Scythian inroads, they deserve notice as the first (at least the first historically known) among the numerous invasions of cultivated Asia and Europe by the Nomads of Tartary. Huns, Avars, Bulgarians, Magyars, Turks, Mongols, Tartars, &c., are found in subsequent centuries repeating the same infliction, and establishing a dominion both more durable, and not less destructive, than the transient scourge of the Scythians during the reign of Kyaxarês.

After the expulsion of the Scythians from Asia, the full extent and power of the Median empire was re-established; and Kyaxarês was enabled again to besiege Nineveh. He took that great city, and reduced under his dominion all the Assyrians except those who formed the kingdom of Babylon. This conquest was achieved towards the close of his reign, and he bequeathed the Median empire, at the maximum of its grandeur, to his son Astyagês, in 595 B.C.[2]

Expulsion of these Nomads, after a temporary occupation.

As the dominion of the Scythians in Upper Asia lasted twenty-eight years before they were expelled by Kyaxarês, so

we combine it with the statement of Hippokratês respecting the peculiar incapacities which were so apt to affect the Scythians, and the religious interpretation put upon them by the sufferers (De Aëre, Locis et Aquis, c. vi. s. 106—109).

[1] See, in reference to the direction of this ditch, Völcker, in the work above referred to on the Scythia of Herodotus (Mythische Geographie, ch. vii. p. 177).

That the ditch existed there can be no reasonable doubt; though the tale given by Herodotus is highly improbable.

[2] Herodot. i. 106. Mr. Clinton fixes the date of the capture of Nineveh at 606 B.C. (F. H. vol. i. p. 269), upon grounds which do not appear to me conclusive: the utmost which can be made out is, that it was taken during the last ten years of the reign of Kyaxarês.

also the inroads of the Cimmerians through Asia Minor, which had begun during the reign of the Lydian king Ardys, continued through the twelve years of the reign of his son Sadyattês (629—617 B.C.), and were finally terminated by Alyattês, son of the latter.[1] Notwithstanding the Cimmerians, however, Sadyattês was in a condition to prosecute a war against the Grecian city of Milêtus, which continued during the last seven years of his reign, and which he bequeathed to his son and successor. Alyattês continued the war for five years longer. So feeble was the sentiment of union among the various Grecian towns on the Asiatic coast, that none of them would lend any aid to Milêtus except the Chians, who were under special obligations to Milêtus for previous aid in a contest against Erythræ. The Milesians unassisted were no match for a Lydian army in the field, though their great naval strength placed them out of all danger of a blockade; and we must presume that the erection of those mounds of earth against the walls, whereby the Persian Harpagus vanquished the Ionian cities half a century afterwards, was then unknown to the Lydians. For twelve successive years the Milesian territory was annually overrun and ravaged, previous to the gathering in of the crop. The inhabitants, after having been defeated in two ruinous battles, gave up all hope of resisting the devastation; so that the task of the invaders became easy, and the Lydian army pursued their destructive march to the sound of flutes and harps. While ruining the crops and the fruit-trees, Alyattês would not allow the farm-buildings or country-houses to be burnt, in order that the means of production might still be preserved, to be again destroyed during the following season. By such unremitting devastation the Milesians were reduced to distress and famine, in spite of their command of the sea. The fate which afterwards overtook them during the reign of Crœsus, of becoming tributary subjects to the throne of Sardis, would have begun half a century earlier, had not Alyattês unintentionally committed a profanation against the goddess Athênê. Her temple at Assêssus accidentally took fire and was consumed, when his soldiers on a windy day were burning the

Lydian kings Sadyattês and Alyattês—war against Milêtus.

[1] From whom Polyænus borrowed his statement, that Alyattês employed with effect savage dogs against the Cimmerians, I do not know (Polyæn. vii. 2, 1).

Milesian standing corn. Though no one took notice of this incident at the time, yet Alyattês, on his return to Sardis, was smitten with prolonged sickness. Unable to obtain relief, he despatched envoys to seek humble advice from the god at Delphi. But the Pythian priestess refused to furnish any healing suggestions until he should have rebuilt the burnt temple of Athênê,—and Periander, at that time despot of Corinth, having learnt the tenor of this reply, transmitted private information of it to Thrasybulus despot of Milêtus, with whom he was intimately allied. Presently there arrived at Milêtus a herald on the part of Alyattês, proposing a truce for the special purpose of enabling him to rebuild the destroyed temple—the Lydian monarch believing the Milesians to be so poorly furnished with subsistence that they would gladly embrace such temporary relief. But the herald on his arrival found abundance of corn heaped up in the agora, and the citizens engaged in feasting and enjoyment; for Thrasybulus had caused all the provision in the town, both public and private, to be brought out, in order that the herald might see the Milesians in a condition of apparent plenty, and carry the news of it to his master. The stratagem succeeded. Alyattês, under the persuasion that his repeated devastation inflicted upon the Milesians no sensible privations, abandoned his hostile designs, and concluded with them a treaty of amity and alliance. It was his first proceeding to build two temples to Athênê, in place of the one which had been destroyed, and he then forthwith recovered from his protracted malady. His gratitude for the cure was testified by the transmission of a large silver bowl, with an iron footstand welded together by the Chian artist Glaukus—the inventor of the art of thus joining together pieces of iron.[1]

Sacrilege committed by Alyattês—oracle—he makes peace with Milêtus.

Alyattês is said to have carried on other operations against some of the Ionic Greeks: he took Smyrna, but was defeated in an inroad on the territory of Klazomenæ.[2] But on the whole his long reign of fifty-seven years was one of tranquillity to the Grecian cities on the coast, though we hear of an expedition which he undertook

Long reign—death—and sepulchre of Alyattês.

[1] Herodot. i. 20—23.

[2] Herodot. i. 18. Polyænus (vii. 2, 2) mentions a proceeding of Alyattês against the Kolophonians.

against Karia.[1] He is reported to have been during youth of overweening insolence, but to have acquired afterwards a just and improved character. By an Ionian wife he became father of Crœsus, whom even during his lifetime he appointed satrap of the town of Adramyttium and the neighbouring plain of Thêbê. But he had also other wives and other sons, and one of the latter, Adramytus, is reported as the founder of Adramyttium.[2] How far his dominion in the interior of Asia Minor extended, we do not know, but very probably his long and comparatively inactive reign may have favoured the accumulation of those treasures which afterwards rendered the wealth of Crœsus so proverbial. His monument, an enormous pyramidal mound upon a stone base, erected near Sardis by the joint efforts of the whole Sardian population, was the most memorable curiosity in Lydia during the time of Herodotus. It was inferior only to the gigantic edifices of Egypt and Babylon.[3]

Crœsus.

Crœsus obtained the throne, at the death of his father, by appointment from the latter. But there was a party among the Lydians who had favoured the pretensions of his brother Pantaleôn. One of the richest chiefs of that party was put to death afterwards by the new king, under the cruel torture of a spiked carding machine—his property being confiscated.[4] The aggressive reign of Crœsus, lasting fourteen years (559—545 B.C.), formed a marked contrast to the long quiescence of his father during a reign of fifty-seven years.

He attacks and conquers the Asiatic Greeks.

Pretences being easily found for war against the Asiatic Greeks, Crœsus attacked them one after the other. Unfortunately we know neither the particulars of these successive aggressions, nor the previous history of the Ionic cities, so as to be able to explain how it was that the fifth of the Mermnad kings of Sardis met with such unqualified success, in an enterprise which his predecessors had attempted in vain. Milêtus alone, with the aid of Chios, had resisted Alyattês and Sadyattês for eleven years—and Crœsus possessed no naval

[1] Nikolaus Damasken. p. 54, ed. Orelli; Xanthi Fragment. p. 243, Creuzer.

Mr. Clinton states Alyattês to have *conquered* Karia, and also Æolis, for neither of which do I find sufficient authority (Fasti Hellen. ch. xvii. p. 298).

[2] Aristoteles ap. Stephan. Byz. v. Ἀδραμυττεῖον.

[3] Herodot. i. 92, 93.

[4] Herodot. i. 92.

force, any more than his father and grandfather. But on this occasion, not one of the towns can have displayed the like individual energy. In regard to the Milesians, we may perhaps suspect that the period now under consideration was comprised in that long duration of intestine conflict which Herodotus represents (though without defining exactly when) to have crippled the forces of the city for two generations, and which was at length appeased by a memorable decision of some arbitrators invited from Paros. These latter, called in by mutual consent of the exhausted antagonist parties at Milêtus, found both the city and her territory in a state of general neglect and ruin. But on surveying the lands, they discovered some which still appeared to be tilled with undiminished diligence and skill: to the proprietors of these lands they consigned the government of the town, in the belief that they would manage the public affairs with as much success as their own.[1] Such a state of intestine weakness would partly explain the easy subjugation of the Milesians by Crœsus; while there was little in the habits of the Ionic cities to present the chance of united efforts against a common enemy. These cities, far from keeping up any effective political confederation, were in a state of habitual jealousy of each other, and not unfrequently in actual war.[2] The common religious festivals—the Deliac festival as well as the Pan-Ionia, and afterwards the Ephesia in place of the Dêlia—seem to have been regularly frequented by all the cities throughout the worst of times. But these assemblies had no direct political function, nor were they permitted to control that sentiment of separate city-autonomy which was paramount in the Greek mind—though their influence was extremely precious in calling forth social sympathies. Apart from the periodical festival, meetings for special emergencies were

Want of co-operation among the Ionic cities.

[1] Herodot. v. 28. *κατύπερθε δὲ τουτέων, ἐπὶ δύο γενέας ἀνδρῶν νοσήσασα τὰ μάλιστα στάσει.*

Alyattês reigned fifty-seven years, and the vigorous resistance which the Milesians offered to him took place in the first six years of his reign. The "two generations of intestine dissension" may well have succeeded after the reign of Thrasybulus. This indeed is a mere conjecture, yet it may be observed that Herodotus, speaking of the time of the Ionic revolt (500 B.C.), and intimating that Milêtus, though then peaceable, had been for two generations at an early period torn by intestine dissension, could hardly have meant these "two generations" to apply to a time earlier than 617 B.C.

[2] Herodot. i. 17; vi. 99: Athenæ. vi. p. 267. Compare K. F. Hermann, Lehrbuch der Griech. Staatsalterthümer, sect. 77, note 28.

held at the Pan-Ionic temple; but from such meetings any city, not directly implicated, kept aloof.[1] As in this case, so in others not less critical throughout the historical period—the incapacity of large political combination was the source of constant danger, and ultimately proved the cause of ruin, to the independence of all the Grecian states. Herodotus warmly commends the advice given by Thalês to his Ionic countrymen—and given (to use his remarkable expression) "before the ruin of Ionia"[2]—that a common senate, invested with authority over all the twelve cities, should be formed within the walls of Teôs, as the most central in position; and that all the other cities should account themselves mere demes of this aggregate commonwealth or Polis. And we cannot doubt that such was the unavailing aspiration of many a patriot of Milêtus or Ephesus, even before the final operations of Crœsus were opened against them.

Unavailing suggestion of Thalês—to merge the twelve Ionic cities into one Pan-Ionic city at Teôs.

That prince attacked the Greek cities successively, finding or making different pretences for hostility against each. He began with Ephesus, which is said to have been then governed by a despot of harsh and oppressive character, named Pindarus, whose father Melas had married a daughter of Alyattês, and who was therefore himself nephew of Crœsus.[3] The latter, having in vain invited Pindarus and the Ephesians to surrender the town, brought up his forces and attacked the walls. One of the towers being overthrown, the Ephesians abandoned all hope of defending their town, and sought safety by placing it under the guardianship of Artemis, to whose temple they carried a rope from the walls—a distance little less than seven furlongs. They at the same time sent a message of supplication to Crœsus, who is said to have granted them the preservation of their

Capture of Ephesus.

[1] See the remarkable case of Milêtus sending no deputies to a Pan-Ionic meeting, being safe herself from danger (Herodot. i. 141).

[2] Herodot. i, 141—170. χρηστὴ δὲ καὶ πρὶν ἢ διαφθαρῆναι Ἰωνίην, Θάλεω ἀνδρὸς Μιλησίου γνώμη ἐγένετο, &c.

About the Pan-Ionia and the Ephesia, see Thucyd. iii. 104; Dionys. Halik. iv. 25; Herodot. i. 143—148. Compare also Whitte, De Rebus Chiorum Publicis, sect. vii. p. 22—26.

[3] If we may believe the narrative of Nikolaus Damaskenus, Crœsus had been in relations with Ephesus and with the Ephesians during the time when he was hereditary prince, and in the life-time of Alyattês. He had borrowed a large sum of money from a rich Ephesian named Pamphaês, which was essential to enable him to perform a military duty imposed upon him by his father. The story is given in some detail by Nikolaus, Fragm. p. 54, ed. Orell.—I know not upon what authority.

liberties, out of reverence to the protection of Artemis; exacting at the same time that Pindarus should quit the place. Such is the tale of which we find a confused mention in Ælian and Polyænus. But Herodotus, while he notices the fact of the long rope whereby the Ephesians sought to place themselves in contact with their divine protectress, does not indicate that Crœsus was induced to treat them more favourably. Ephesus, like all the other Grecian towns on the coast, was brought under subjection and tribute to him.[1] How he dealt with them, and what degree of coercive precaution he employed either to ensure subjection or collect tribute, the brevity of the historian does not acquaint us. But they were required partially at least, if not entirely, to raze their fortifications; for on occasion of the danger which supervened a few years afterwards from Cyrus, they are found practically unfortified.[2]

Thus completely successful in his aggressions on the continental Asiatic Greeks, Crœsus conceived the idea of assembling a fleet, for the purpose of attacking the islanders of Chios and Samos; but became convinced (as some said, by the sarcastic remark of one of the seven Greek sages, Bias or Pittakus) of the impracticability of the project. He carried his arms, however, with full success, over other parts of the continent of Asia Minor, until he had subdued the whole territory within the river Halys, excepting only the Kilikians and the Lykians. The Lydian empire thus reached the maximum of its power, comprehending, besides the Æolic, Ionic, and Doric Greeks on the coast of Asia Minor, the Phrygians, Mysians, Mariandynians, Chalybes, Paphlagonians, Thynian and Bithynian Thracians, Karians, and Pamphylians. And the treasures amassed by Crœsus at Sardis, derived partly from this great number of tributaries, partly from mines in various

Crœsus king of all Asia westward of the Halys.

[1] Herodot. i. 26; Ælian, V. H. iii. 26; Polyæn. vi. 50. The story contained in Ælian and Polyænus seems to come from Batôn of Sinôpê: see Guhl, Ephesiaca, ii. 3, p. 26, and iv. 5, p. 150.

The article in Suidas, v. Ἀρίσταρχος, is far too vague to be interwoven as a positive fact into Ephesian history (as Guhl interweaves it) immediately consequent on the retirement of Pindarus.

In reference to the rope reaching from the city to the Artemision, we may quote an analogous case of the Kylonian suppliants at Athens, who sought to maintain their contact with the altar by means of a continuous cord—unfortunately the cord broke (Plutarch, Solôn, c. 12).

[2] Herodot. i. 141. Ἴωνες δὲ, ὡς ἤκουσαν—τείχεά τε περιεβάλλοντο ἕκαστοι, &c.: compare also the statement respecting Phôkæa, c. 168.

places, as well as the auriferous sands of the Paktôlus, exceeded anything which the Greeks had ever before known.

We learn, from the brief but valuable observations of Herodotus, to appreciate the great importance of these conquests of Crœsus, with reference not merely to the Grecian cities actually subjected, but also indirectly to the whole Grecian world.

New and important æra for the Hellenic world—commencing with the conquests of Crœsus.

"Before the reign of Crœsus (observes the historian) all the Greeks were free: it was by him first that Greeks were subdued into tribute." And he treats this event as the initial phænomenon of the series, out of which grew the hostile relations between the Greeks on one side, and Asia as represented by the Persians on the other, which were uppermost in the minds of himself and his contemporaries.

It was in the case of Crœsus that the Greeks were first called upon to deal with a tolerably large barbaric aggregate under a warlike and enterprising prince, and the result was such as to manifest the inherent weakness of their political system, from its incapacity of large combination. The separated autonomous cities could only maintain their independence either through similar disunion on the part of barbaric adversaries, or by superiority, on their own side, of military organisation as well as of geographical position. The situation of Greece Proper and of the islands was favourable to the maintenance of such a system: not so the shores of Asia with a wide interior country behind. The Ionic Greeks were at this time different from what they became during the ensuing century. Little inferior in energy to Athens or to the general body of European Greeks, they could doubtless have maintained their independence, had they cordially combined. But it will be seen hereafter that the Greek colonies—planted as isolated settlements, and indisposed to political union, even when neighbours—all of them fell into dependence so soon as attack from the interior came to be powerfully organised; especially if that organisation was conducted by leaders partially improved through contact with the Greeks themselves. Small autonomous cities maintain themselves so long as they have only enemies of the like strength to deal with: but to resist larger aggregates requires such a concurrence of favourable circumstances as can hardly remain long without interruption. And the ultimate sub-

jection of entire Greece, under the kings of Macedon, was only an exemplification on the widest scale of this same principle.

The Lydian monarchy under Crœsus, the largest with which the Greeks had come into contact down to that moment, was very soon absorbed into a still larger—the Persian; of which the Ionic Greeks, after unavailing resistance, became the subjects. The partial sympathy and aid which they obtained from the independent or European Greeks, their western neighbours, followed by the fruitless attempt on the part of the Persian king to add these latter to his empire, gave an entirely new turn to Grecian history and proceedings. First, it necessitated a degree of central action against the Persians which was foreign to Greek political instinct; next, it opened to the noblest and most enterprising section of the Hellenic name—the Athenians—an opportunity of placing themselves at the head of this centralising tendency; while a concurrence of circumstances, foreign and domestic, imparted to them at the same time that extraordinary and many-sided impulse, combining action with organisation, which gave such brilliancy to the period of Herodotus and Thucydidês. It is thus that most of the splendid phænomena of Grecian history grew, directly or indirectly, out of the reluctant dependence in which the Asiatic Greeks were held by the inland barbaric powers beginning with Crœsus.

Action of the Lydian empire continued on a still larger scale by the Persians.

These few observations will suffice to intimate that a new phase of Grecian history is now on the point of opening. Down to the time of Crœsus, almost everything which is done or suffered by the Grecian cities bears only upon one or other of them separately: the instinct of the Greeks repudiates even the modified form of political centralisation, and there are no circumstances in operation to force it upon them. Relation of power and subjection exists between a strong and a weak state, but no tendency to standing political co-ordination. From this time forward, we shall see partial causes at work, tending in this direction, and not without considerable influence; though always at war with the indestructible instinct of the nation, and frequently counteracted by selfishness and misconduct on the part of the leading cities.

# CHAPTER XVIII.

## PHŒNICIANS.

OF the Phœnicians, Assyrians, and Egyptians, it is necessary for me to speak so far as they acted upon the condition, or occupied the thoughts, of the early Greeks, without undertaking to investigate thoroughly their previous history. Like the Lydians, all three became absorbed into the vast mass of the Persian empire, retaining however their social character and peculiarities after having been robbed of their political independence.

The Persians and Medes—portions of the Arian race, and members of what has been classified, in respect of language, as the great Indo-European family—occupied a part of the vast space comprehended between the Indus on the east, and the line of Mount Zagros (running eastward of the Tigris and nearly parallel with that river) on the west. The Phœnicians as well as the Assyrians belonged to the Semitic, Aramæan, or Syro-Arabian family, comprising, besides, the Syrians, Jews, Arabians, and in part the Abyssinians. To what established family of the human race the swarthy and curly-haired Egyptians are to be assigned has been much disputed. We cannot reckon them as members of either of the two preceding, and the most careful inquiries render it probable that their physical type was something purely African, approximating in many points to that of the Negro.[1]

Phœnicians and Assyrians—members of the Semitic family of the human race.

[1] See the discussion in Dr. Prichard, Natural History of Man, sect. xvii. p. 152.

Μελαγχρόες καὶ οὐλότριχες (Herodot. ii. 104; compare Ammian. Marcell. xxii. 16, "subfusculi, atrati," &c.) are certain attributes of the ancient Egyptians, depending upon the evidence of an eye-witness.

"In their complexion, and in many of their physical peculiarities (observes Dr. Prichard, p. 138), the Egyptians were an African race. In the eastern and even in the central parts of Africa, we shall trace the existence of various tribes in physical characters nearly resembling the Egyptians; and it would not be difficult to observe among

It has already been remarked that the Phœnician merchant and trading vessel figures in the Homeric poems as a well-known visitor, and that the variegated robes and golden ornaments fabricated at Sidon are prized among the valuable ornaments belonging to the chiefs.[1] We have reason to conclude generally, that in these early times, the Phœnicians traversed the Ægean Sea habitually, and even formed settlements for trading and mining purposes upon some of its islands. On Thasos, especially, near the coast of Thrace, traces of their abandoned gold-mines were visible even in the days of Herodotus, indicating both persevering labour and considerable length of occupation. But at the time when the historical æra opens, they seem to have been in course of gradual retirement from these regions.[2] Their commerce had taken a different direction. Of this change we can furnish no particulars; but we may easily understand that the increase of the Grecian marine, both warlike and commercial, would render it inconvenient for the Phœnicians to encounter such enterprising rivals—piracy (or private war at sea) being then an habitual proceeding, especially with regard to foreigners.

Early presence of Phœnician ships in the Grecian seas—in the Homeric times.

The Phœnician towns occupied a narrow strip of the coast of Syria and Palestine, about 120 miles in length—never more, and

many nations of that continent a gradual deviation from the physical type of the Egyptian to the strongly-marked character of the Negro, and that without any very decided break or interruption. The Egyptian language also, in the great leading principles of its grammatical construction, bears much greater analogy to the idioms of Africa than to those prevalent among the people of other regions."

[1] Homer, Iliad, vi. 290; xxiii. 740; Odyss. xv. 116:—

. . . πέπλοι παμποίκιλοι, ἔργα γυναικῶν
Σιδονίων.

Tyre is not named either in the Iliad or Odyssey, though a passage in Probus (ad Virg. Georg. ii. 115) seems to show that it was mentioned in one of the epics which passed under the name of Homer: "Tyrum Sarrem appellatam esse, Homerus docet: quem etiam Ennius sequitur cum dicit, Pœnos Sarrâ oriundos".

The Hesiodic catalogue seems to have noticed both Byblus and Sidon: see Hesiodi Fragment. xxx. ed. Marktscheffel, and Etymolog. Magnum. v. Βύβλος.

[2] The name Adramyttion or Atramyttion (very like the Africo-Phœnician name *Adrumêtum*) is said to be of Phœnician origin (Olshausen. De Origine Alphabeti, p. 7, in Kieler Philologische Studien. 1841). There were valuable mines afterwards worked for the account of Crœsus near Pergamus, and these mines may have tempted Phœnician settlers to those regions (Aristotel. Mirab. Auscult. c. 52).

The African inscriptions, in the Monumenta Phœnic. of Gesenius, recognise Makar as a cognomen of Baal: and Movers imagines that the hero Makar, who figures conspicuously in the mythology of Lesbos, Chios, Samos, Kôs, Rhodes, &c., is traceable to this Phœnician god and Phœnician early settlements in those islands (Movers, Die Religion der Phönicier, p. 420).

generally much less, than twenty miles in breadth—between Mount Libanus and the sea. Aradus (on an islet, with Antaradus and Marathus over against it on the mainland) was the northernmost, and Tyre the southernmost (also upon a little island, with Palæ-Tyrus and a fertile adjacent plain over against it). Between the two were situated Sidon, Berytus, Tripolis, and Byblus, besides some smaller towns[1]

Situation and cities of Phœnicia.

[1] Strabo, xvi. p. 754—758; Skylax, Peripl. c. 104; Justin, xviii. 3; Arrian, Exp. Al. ii. 16—19; Xenophôn, Anab. i. 5, 6.

Unfortunately the text of Skylax is here extremely defective, and Strabo's account is in many points perplexed, from his not having travelled in person through Phœnicia, Cœle-Syria, or Judæa: see Grosskurd's note on p. 755, and the Einleitung to his Translation of Strabo, sect. 6.

Respecting the original relation between Palæ-Tyrus and Tyre, there is some difficulty in reconciling all the information, little as it is, which we possess. The name Palæ-Tyrus (it has been assumed as a matter of course: compare Justin. xi. 10) marks that town as the original foundation from which the Tyrians subsequently moved into the island: there was also on the mainland a place named Palæ-Byblos (Plin. H. N. v. 20; Ptolem. v. 15), which was in like manner construed as the original seat from whence the town properly called Byblus was derived. Yet the account of Herodotus plainly represents the insular Tyrus, with its temple of Hêraklês, as the original foundation (ii. 44), and the Tyrians are described as living in an island even in the time of their king Hiram, the contemporary of Solomon (Joseph. Ant. Jud. viii. 2, 7). Arrian treats the temple of Hêraklês in the island Tyre as the most ancient temple within the memory of man (Exp. Al. ii. 16). The Tyrians also lived on their island during the invasion of Salmaneser king of Nineveh, and their position enabled them to hold out against him, while Palæ-Tyrus on the terra firma was obliged to yield itself (Joseph. *ib.* ix. 14, 2). The town taken (or reduced to capitulate), after a long siege, by Nebuchadnezzar, was the insular Tyrus, not the continental or Palæ-Tyrus, which had surrendered without resistance to Salmaneser. It is not correct, therefore, to say—with Volney (Recherches sur l'Hist. Anc. ch. xiv. p. 249), Heeren (Ideen über den Verkehr der Alten Welt, part i. Abth. 2, p. 11) and others—that the insular Tyre was called new Tyre, and that the site of Tyre was changed from continental to insular, in consequence of the taking of the continental Tyre by Nebuchadnezzar: the site remained unaltered, and the insular Tyrians became subject to him and his successors until the destruction of the Chaldæan monarchy by Cyrus. Hengstenberg's Dissertation, De Rebus Tyriorum (Berlin, 1832), is instructive on many of these points: he shows sufficiently that Tyre was, from the earliest times traceable, an insular city; but he wishes at the same time to show, that it was also, from the beginning, joined on to the mainland by an isthmus (p. 10—25)—which is both inconsistent with the former position and unsupported by any solid proofs. It remained an island strictly so-called, until the siege by Alexander: the mole, by which that conqueror had stormed it, continued after his day, perhaps enlarged, so as to form a permanent connexion from that time forward between the island and the mainland (Plin. H. N. v. 19; Strabo, xvi. p. 757), and to render the insular Tyrus capable of being included by Pliny in one computation of circumference jointly with Palæ-Tyrus, the mainland town.

It may be doubted whether we know the true meaning of the word which the Greeks called Παλαι-Τύρος. It is plain that the Tyrians themselves did not call it by that name: perhaps the Phœnician name which this continental adjacent town bore may have been something resembling Palæ-Tyrus in sound but not coincident in meaning.

The strength of Tyre lay in its insular situation; for the adjacent mainland, whereon Palæ-Tyrus was placed, was a fertile plain, thus described by William of Tyre during the time of the Crusaders:—

"Erat prædicta civitas non solum

attached to one or other of these last-mentioned, and several islands close to the coast occupied in like manner; while the colony of Myriandrus lay further north, near the borders of Kilikia. Whether Sidon or Tyre was the most ancient, seems not determinable. If it be true, as some authorities affirmed, that Tyre was originally planted from Sidon, the colony must have grown so rapidly as to surpass its metropolis in power and consideration; for it became the chief of all the Phœnician towns.[1] Aradus, the next in importance after these two, was founded by exiles from Sidon, and all the rest either by Tyrian or Sidonian settlers. Within this confined territory was concentrated a greater degree of commercial wealth, enterprise, and manufacturing ingenuity than could be found in any other portion of the contemporary world. Each town was an independent community, having its own surrounding territory and political constitution and its own hereditary prince;[2] though the annals of Tyre display many instances of princes assassinated by men who succeeded them on the throne. Tyre appears to have enjoyed a certain presiding, perhaps controlling, authority over all of them, which was not always willingly submitted to; and examples occur in which the inferior towns, when Tyre was pressed by a foreign enemy,[3] took the opportunity of revolting, or at least stood aloof. The same difficulty of managing satis-

munitissima, sed etiam fertilitate præcipuâ et amœnitate quasi singularis: nam licet in medio mari sita est, et in modum insulæ tota fluctibus cincta; habet tamen pro foribus latifundium per omnia commendabile, et planitiem sibi continuam divitis glebæ et opimi soli, multas civibus ministrans commoditates. Quæ licet modica videatur respectu aliarum regionum, exiguitatem suam multâ redimit ubertate, et infinita jugera multiplici fœcunditate compensat. Nec tamen tantis arctatur angustiis. Protenditur enim in Austrum versus Ptolemaidem usque ad eum locum, qui hodie vulgo dicitur districtum Scandarionis, milliaribus quatuor aut quinque: e regione in Septentrionem versus Sareptam et Sidonem iterum porrigitur totidem milliaribus. In latitudinem vero ubi minimum ad duo, ubi plurimum ad tria, habens milliaria." (Apud Hengstenberg *ut sup.* p. 5.) Compare Maundrell, Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem, p. 50, ed. 1749; and Volney, Travels in Egypt and Syria, vol. ii. p. 210—226.

[1] Justin (xviii. 3) states that Sidon was the metropolis of Tyre, but the series of events which he recounts is confused and unintelligible. Strabo also, in one place, calls Sidon the μητρόπολις τῶν Φοινίκων (i. p. 40); in another place he states it as a point disputed between the two cities, which of them was the μητρόπολις τῶν Φοινίκων (xvi. p. 756).

Quintus Curtius affirms both Tyre and Sidon to have been founded by Agênôr (iv. 4, 15).

[2] See the interesting citations of Josephus from Dius and Menander, who had access to the Tyrian ἀναγραφαί, or chronicles (Josephus cont. Apion. i. c. 17, 18, 21; Antiqq. J. x. 11, 1).

[3] Joseph. Antiqq. J. ix. 14, 2.

factorily the relations between a presiding town and its confederates, which Grecian history manifests, is found also to prevail in Phœnicia, and will be hereafter remarked in regard to Carthage; while the same effects are also perceived, of the autonomous city polity, in keeping alive the individual energies and regulated aspirations of the inhabitants. The predominant sentiment of jealous town-isolation is forcibly illustrated by the circumstances of Tripolis, established jointly by Tyre, Sidon, and Aradus. It consisted of three distinct towns, each one furlong apart from the other two, and each with its own separate walls; though probably constituting to a certain extent one political community, and serving as a place of common meeting and deliberation for the entire Phœnician name.[1] The outlying promontories of Libanus and Anti-Libanus touched the sea along the Phœnician coast, and those mountainous ranges, though rendering a large portion of the very confined area unfit for cultivation of corn, furnished what was perhaps yet more indispensable—abundant supplies of timber for ship-building; while the entire want of all wood in Babylonia, except the date palm, restricted the Assyrians of that territory from maritime traffic on the Persian Gulf. It appears however that the mountains of Lebanon also afforded shelter to tribes of predatory Arabs, who continually infested both the Phœnician territory and the rich neighbouring plain of Cœle-Syria.[2]

The splendid temple of that great Phœnician god (Melkarth), whom the Greeks called Hêraklês,[3] was situated in Tyre. The Tyrians affirmed that its establishment had been coeval with the first foundation of the city, 2300 years before the time of Herodotus. This god, the companion and protector of their colonial settlements, and the ancestor of the Phœnico-Libyan kings, is found especially at Carthage, Gadês, and Thasos.[4] Some supposed that the Phœnicians had migrated to their site on the Mediterranean coast from previous abodes near the mouth of the Euphrates,[5] or on islands (named Tylus and Aradus) of the

[1] Diodôr. xvi. 41; Skylax, c. 104.

[2] Strabo, xvi. p. 756.

[3] A Maltese inscription identifies the Tyrian Melkarth with Ἡρακλῆς (Gesenius, Monument. Phœnic. tab. vi.).

[4] Herodot. ii. 44; Sallust, Bell. Jug. c. 18; Pausan. x. 12, 2; Arrian. Exp. Al. ii. 16; Justin, xliv. 5; Appian, vi. 2.

[5] Herodot. i. 2; Ephorus, Frag. 40, ed. Marx; Strabo, xvi. p. 766—784, with Grosskurd's note on the former passage; Justin. xviii. 3. In the

Persian Gulf; while others treated the Mediterranean Phœnicians as original, and the others as colonists. Whether such be the fact or not, history knows them in no other portion of Asia earlier than in Phœnicia proper.

Though the invincible industry and enterprise of the Phœnicians maintained them as a people of importance down to the period of the Roman empire, yet the period of their widest range and greatest efficiency is to be sought much earlier—anterior to 700 B.C. In these remote times they and their colonists were the exclusive navigators of the Mediterranean: the rise of the Greek maritime settlements banished their commerce to a great degree from the Ægean Sea, and embarrassed it even in the more westerly waters. Their colonial establishments were formed in Africa, Sicily, Sardinia, the Balearic Isles, and Spain. The

Phœnician commerce flourished more in the earlier than in the later times.

animated discussion carried on among the Homeric critics and the great geographers of antiquity, to ascertain *where* it was that Menelaus actually went during his eight years' wandering (Odyss. iv. 81—85)—

. . ἦ γὰρ πολλὰ παθὼν καὶ πόλλ' ἐπαλήθεὶς
Ἠγαγόμην ἐν νηυσὶ, καὶ ὀγδοάτῳ ἔτει ἦλθον·
Κύπρον, Φοινίκην τε, καὶ Αἰγυπτίους ἐπαλήθεὶς
Αἰθίοπάς τ' ἰκόμην, καὶ Σιδονίους, καὶ Ἐρεμβοὺς,
Καὶ Λιβύην, &c.—

one idea started was, that he had visited these Sidonians in the Persian Gulf, or in the Erythræan Sea (Strabo, i. p. 42). The various opinions which Strabo quotes, including those of Eratosthenês and Kratês, as well as his own comments, are very curious. Kratês supposed that Menelaus had passed the Straits of Gibraltar and circumnavigated Libya to Æthiopia and India, which voyage would suffice (he thought) to fill up the eight years. Others supposed that Menelaus had sailed first up the Nile, and then into the Red Sea, by means of the canal (διωρυξ) which existed in the time of the Alexandrine critics between the Nile and the sea; to which Strabo replies that this canal was not made until after the Trojan war. Eratosthenês stated a still more remarkable idea: he thought that in the time of Homer the Strait of Gibraltar had not yet been burst open, so that the Mediterranean was on that side a closed sea; but, on the other hand, its level was then so much higher, that it covered the Isthmus of Suez, and joined the Red Sea. It was (he thought) the disruption of the Strait of Gibraltar which first lowered the level of the water, and left the Isthmus of Suez dry; though Menelaus, in *his* time, had sailed from the Mediterranean into the Red Sea without difficulty. This opinion Eratosthenês had imbibed from Stratôn of Lampsakus, the successor of Theophrastus: Hipparchus controverted it, together with many other of the opinions of Eratosthenês (see Strabo, i. pp. 38, 49, 56; Seidel, Fragmenta Eratosthenis, p. 39).

In reference to the view of Kratês—that Menelaus had sailed round Africa—it is to be remarked that all the geographers of that day formed to themselves a very insufficient idea of the extent of that continent, believing that it did not even reach so far southward as the equator.

Strabo himself adopts neither of these three opinions, but construes the Homeric words describing the wanderings of Menelaus as applying only to the coasts of Egypt, Libya, Phœnicia, &c. He suggests various reasons, more curious than convincing, to prove that Menelaus may easily have spent eight years in these visits of mixed friendship and piracy.

greatness as well as the antiquity of Carthage, Utica, and Gadês, attest the long-sighted plans of Phœnician traders, even in days anterior to the first Olympiad. We trace the wealth and industry of Tyre, and the distant navigation of her vessels through the Red Sea and along the coast of Arabia, back to the days of David and Solomon. And as neither Egyptians, Assyrians, Persians, or Indians addressed themselves to a seafaring life, so it seems that both the importation and the distribution of the products of India and Arabia into Western Asia and Europe were performed by the Idumæan Arabs between Petra and the Red Sea—by the Arabs of Gerrha on the Persian Gulf, joined as they were in later times by a body of Chaldæan exiles from Babylonia—and by the more enterprising Phœnicians of Tyre and Sidon in these two seas as well as in the Mediterranean.[1]

Phœnician colonies—Utica, Carthage, Gadês, &c.

The most ancient Phœnician colonies were Utica, nearly on the northernmost point of the coast of Africa and in the same gulf (now called the Gulf of Tunis) as Carthage, over against Cape Lilybæum in Sicily—and Gadês, or Gadeira, in Tartêssus, or the south-western coast of Spain. The latter town, founded perhaps near 1000 years before the Christian æra,[2] has maintained a continuous prosperity and a name (Cadiz) substantially unaltered, longer than any town in Europe. How well the site of Utica was suited to the circumstances of Phœnician colonists may be inferred from the fact that Carthage was afterwards established in the same gulf and near to the same spot, and that both the two cities reached a high pitch of prosperity. The distance of Gadês from Tyre seems surprising, and if we calculate by time instead of by space, the Tyrians were separated from their Tartêssian colonists by an interval greater than that which now divides an Englishman from Bombay; for the ancient navigator always coasted along the land, and Skylax reckons seventy-five days[3] of voyage from the

[1] See Ritter, Erdkunde von Asien, West-Asien, Buch iii. Abtheilung iii. Abschnitt i. s. 29, p. 50.

[2] Strabo speaks of the earliest settlements of the Phœnicians in Africa and Iberia as μικρὸν τῶν Τρωϊκῶν ὕστερον (i. p. 48). Utica is affirmed to have been 287 years earlier than Carthage (Aristot. Mirab. Auscult. c. 134): compare Velleius Paterc. i. 2. Archaleus, son of Phœnix, was stated as the founder of Gadês in the Phœnician history of Claudius Julius, now lost (Etymolog. Magn. v. Γαδείρα). Archaleus is a version of the name Hercules, in the opinion of Movers.

[3] Skylax, Periplus, c. 110. "Carteia ut quidam putant, aliquando Tartessus; et quam transvecti ex Africâ Phœnices habitant, atque unde nos sumus, Tin-

Kanôpic (westernmost) mouth of the Nile to the pillars of Hêraklês (Strait of Gibraltar); to which some more days must be added to represent the full distance between Tyre and Gadês. But the enterprise of these early mariners surmounted all difficulties consistent with the principle of never losing sight of the coast. Proceeding along the northern coast of Libya, at a time when the mouths of the Nile were still closed by Egyptian jealousy against all foreign ships, they appear to have found little temptation to colonise[1] on the dangerous coast near to the two gulfs called the Great and Little Syrtis—in a territory for the most part destitute of water, and occupied by rude Libyan Nomads, who were thinly spread over the wide space between the western Nile[2] and Cape Hermæa, now called Cape Bona. The subsequent Grecian towns of Kyrênê and Barka, whose well-chosen site formed an exception to the general character of the region, were not planted with any view to commerce;[3] while the Phœnician town of Leptis, near the gulf called the Great Syrtis, was established more as a shelter for exiles from Sidon, than by a preconcerted scheme of colonisation. The site of Utica and Carthage, in the gulf immediately westward of Cape Bona, was convenient for commerce with Sicily, Italy, and Sardinia; and the other Phœnician colonies, Adrumêtum, Neapolis, Hippo (two towns so called), the Lesser Leptis, &c., were settled on the coast not far distant from the eastern or

gentera" (Mela, ii. 6, 75). The expression *transvecti ex Africâ* applies as much to the Phœnicians as to the Carthaginians: "*utergue Pœnus*" (Horat. Od. ii. 11) means the Carthaginians, and the Phœnicians of Gadês.

[1] Strabo, xvii. p. 836.

[2] Cape Soloeis, considered by Herodotus as the westernmost headland of Libya, coincides in name with the Phœnician town Soloeis in Western Sicily, also (seemingly) with the Phœnician settlement *Sal* (Mela, ii. 6, 65) in Southern Iberia or Tartessus. Cape Hermæa was the name of the north-eastern headland of the Gulf of Tunis, and also the name of a cape in Libya two days' sail westward of the Pillars of Hêraklês (Skylax, c. 111).

Probably all the remarkable headlands in these seas received their names from the Phœnicians. Both Mannert (Geogr. d. Gr. und Röm. x. 2, p. 495) and Forbiger (Alte Geogr. sect. 111, p. 867) identify Cape Soloeis with what is now called Cape Cantin; Heeren considers it to be the same as Cape Blanco; Bougainville as Cape Boyador.

[3] Sallust, Bell. Jug. c. 78. It was termed Leptis Magna, to distinguish it from another Leptis, more to the westward and nearer to Carthage, called Leptis Parva; but this latter seems to have been generally known by the name Leptis (Forbiger, Alte Geogr. sect. 109, p. 844). In Leptis Magna the proportion of Phœnician colonists was so inconsiderable that the Phœnician language had been lost, and that of the natives, whom Sallust calls Numidians, spoken; but these people had embraced Sidonian institutions and civilization (Sall. *ib.*).

western promontories which included the Gulf of Tunis, common to Carthage and Utica.

These early Phœnician settlements were planted thus in the territory now known as the kingdom of Tunis and the eastern portion of the French province of Constantine. From thence to the Pillars of Hêraklês (Strait of Gibraltar) we do not hear of any others. But the colony of Gadês, outside of the Strait, formed the centre of a flourishing and extensive commerce, which reached on one side far to the south, not less than thirty days' sail along the western coast of Africa[1]—and on the other side to Britain and the Scilly Islands. There were numerous Phœnician factories and small trading towns along the western coast of what is now the empire of Morocco; while the island of Kernê, twelve days' sail along the coast from the Strait of Gibraltar, formed an established depôt for Phœnician merchandise in trading with the interior. There were, moreover, not far distant from the coast, towns of Libyans or Ethiopians, to which the inhabitants of the central regions resorted, and where they brought their leopard skins and elephants' teeth to be exchanged against the unguents of Tyre and the pottery of Athens.[2] So distant a trade, with the limited navigation of that day, could not be made to embrace very bulky goods.

*Commerce of the Phœnicians of Gadês—towards Africa on one side and Britain on the other.*

But this trade, though seemingly a valuable one, constituted

[1] Strabo, xvii. p. 825, 826. He found it stated by some authors that there had once been three hundred trading establishments along this coast, reaching thirty days' voyage southward from Tingis (Tangier); but that they had been chiefly ruined by the tribes of the interior—the Pharusians and Nigritæ. He suspects the statement of being exaggerated, but there seems nothing at all incredible in it. From Strabo's language we gather that Eratosthenês set forth the statement as in his judgment a true one. The text of Strabo, p. 825, as we read it, confounds Tingis with Lixus; another Phœnician settlement about two days' journey southward along the coast, and according to some reports even older than Gadês. See the interesting and valuable Travels of Dr. Barth, the last describer of this now uninviting region—Wanderungen durch die Küstenländer des Mittelmeers, ch. i. p. 23—49. I had in my former edition followed Strabo in confounding Tingis with Lixus: an error pointed out by Dr. Barth, and by Grosskurd.

[2] Compare Skylax, c. 111, and the Periplus of Hanno, ap. Hudson, Geogr. Græc. Min. vol. i. p. 1—6. I have already observed that the τάριχος (salt provisions) from Gadeira was currently sold in the markets of Athens, from the Peloponnesian war downward.—Eupolis, Fragm. 23; Μαρικᾶς, p. 506, ed. Meineke, Comic. Græc.

Πότερ' ἦν τὸ τάριχος; Φρύγιον ἢ Γαδειρικόν;

Compare the citations from the other comic writers, Antiphanês and Nikostratus ap. Athenæ. iii. p. 118. The Phœnician merchants bought in exchange Attic pottery for their African trade.

only a small part of the sources of wealth, open to the Phœnicians of Gadês. The Turditanians and Turduli, who occupied the south-western portion of Spain between the Anas river (Guadiana) and the Mediterranean, seem to have been the most civilised and improvable section of the Iberian tribes, well-suited for commercial relations with the settlers who occupied the Isle of Leon, and who established the temple, afterwards so rich and frequented, of the Tyrian Hêraklês. And the extreme productiveness of the southern region of Spain, in corn, fish, cattle, and wine, as well as in silver and iron, is a topic upon which we find but one language among ancient writers. The territory round Gadês, Carteia, and the other Phœnician settlements in this district, was known to the Greeks in the sixth century B.C. by the name of Tartêssus, and regarded by them somewhat in the same light as Mexico and Peru appeared to the Spaniards of the sixteenth century. For three or four centuries the Phœnicians had possessed the entire monopoly of this Tartêssian trade, without any rivalry on the parts of the Greeks. Probably the metals there procured were in those days their most precious acquisition, and the tribes who occupied the mining regions of the interior found a new market and valuable demand, for produce then obtained with a degree of facility exaggerated into fable.[1] It was from Gadês as a centre that these enterprising traders, pushing their coasting voyage yet further, established relations with the tin-mines of Cornwall, perhaps also with amber-gatherers from the coasts of the Baltic. It requires some effort to carry back our imaginations to the time when, along all this vast length of country, from Tyre and Sidon to the coast of Cornwall, there was no merchant-ship to buy or sell goods except these Phœnicians. The rudest tribes find advantage in such visitors; and we cannot doubt, that the men whose resolute love of gain braved so many hazards and difficulties, must have been rewarded with profits on the largest scale of monopoly.

Productive region round Gadês, called Tartêssus.

The Phœnician settlers on the coast of Spain became gradually more and more numerous, and appear to have been distributed, either in separate townships or intermingled with the native population, between the mouth of the Anas (Guadiana) and the

[1] About the productiveness of the Spanish mines, Polybius (xxxiv. 9, 8) ap. Strabo, iii. p. 147: Aristot. Mirab. Ausc. c. 135.

town of Malaka (Malaga) on the Mediterranean. Unfortunately we are very little informed about their precise localities and details, but we find no information of Phœnician settlements on the Mediterranean coast of Spain northward of Malaka; for Carthagena or New Carthage was a Carthaginian settlement, founded only in the third century B.C.—after the first Punic war.[1] The Greek word Phœnicians being used to signify as well the inhabitants of Carthage as those of Tyre and Sidon, it is not easy to distinguish what belongs to each of them. Nevertheless we can discern a great and important difference in the character of their establishments, especially in Iberia. The Carthaginians combined with their commercial projects large schemes of conquest and empire. It is thus that the independent Phœnician establishments in and near the Gulf of Tunis in Africa were reduced to dependence upon them—while many new small townships, direct from Carthage itself, were planted on the Mediterranean coast of Africa, and the whole of that coast from the Greek Syrtis westward to the Pillars of Hêraklês (Strait of Gibraltar) is described as their territory in the Periplus of Skylax (B.C. 360). In Iberia, during the third century B.C., they maintained large armies,[2] constrained the inland tribes to subjection, and acquired a dominion which nothing but the superior force of Rome prevented from being durable; while in Sicily also the resistance of the Greeks prevented a similar consummation. But the foreign settlements of Tyre and Sidon were formed with views purely commercial. In the region of Tartêssus, as well as in the western coast of Africa outside of the Strait of Gibraltar, we hear only of pacific interchange and metallurgy; and the number of Phœnicians who acquired gradually settlements in the interior was so great, that Strabo describes these towns (not less than 200 in number) as altogether phœnicised.[3] Since, in his time, the circumstances favourable to new Phœnician immigrations had been long past and gone, there can be little hesitation in ascribing the preponderance, which this foreign

Phœnicians and Carthaginians—the establishments of the latter combined views of empire with views of commerce.

[1] Strabo, iii. pp. 156, 158, 161; Polybius, iii. 10, 3—10.

[2] Polyb. i. 10; ii. 1.

[3] Strabo, iii. p. 141—150. Οὗτοι γὰρ Φοίνιξιν οὕτως ἐγένοντο ὑποχείριοι, ὥστε τὰς πλείονς τῶν ἐν τῇ Τουρδιτανίᾳ πόλεων καὶ τῶν πλησίον τόπων ὑπ' ἐκείνων νῦν οἰκεῖσθαι.

element had then acquired, to a period several centuries earlier, beginning at a time when Tyre and Sidon enjoyed both undisputed autonomy at home and the entire monopoly of Iberian commerce, without interference from the Greeks.

The earliest Grecian colony founded in Sicily was that of Naxos, planted by the Chalkidians in 735 B.C.: Syracuse followed in the next year, and during the succeeding century many flourishing Greek cities took root on the island. These Greeks found the Phœnicians already in possession of many outlying islets and promontories all round the island, which served them in their trade with the Sikels and Sikans who occupied the interior. The safety and facilities of this established trade were to so great a degree broken up by the new-comers, that the Phœnicians, relinquishing their numerous petty settlements round the island, concentrated themselves in three considerable towns at the south-western angle near Lilybæum[1]—Motyê, Soloeis, and Panormus—and in the island of Malta, where they were least widely separated from Utica and Carthage. The Tyrians of that day were hard-pressed by the Assyrians under Salmaneser, and the power of Carthage had not yet reached its height; otherwise probably this retreat of the Sicilian Phœnicians before the Greeks would not have taken place without a struggle. But the early Phœnicians, superior to the Greeks in mercantile activity, and not disposed to contend, except under circumstances of very superior force, with warlike adventurers bent on permanent settlement—took the prudent course of circumscribing their sphere of operations. A similar change appears to have taken place in Cyprus, the other island in which Greeks and Phœnicians came into close contact. If we may trust the Tyrian annals consulted by the historian Menander, Cyprus was subject to the Tyrians even in the time of Solomon.[2] We do not know the dates of the establishment of Paphos, Salamis, Kitium, and the other Grecian cities there planted; but there can be no doubt that they were posterior to this period, and that a considerable portion of the soil and trade

Phœnicians and Greeks in Sicily and Cyprus—the latter partially supplant the former.

[1] Thucyd. vi. 3; Diodôr. v. 12.

[2] See the reference in Joseph. Antiq. Jud. viii. 5, 3, and Joseph. cont. Apion. i. 18; an allusion is to be found in Virgil, Æneid. i. 622. in the mouth of Dido:—

"Genitor tum Belus opimam
Vastabat Cyprum, et victor ditione tenebat".

of Cyprus thus passed from Phœnicians to Greeks; who on their part partially embraced and diffused the rites, sometimes voluptuous, embodied in the Phœnician religion.[1] In Kilikia, too, especially at Tarsus, the intrusion of Greek settlers appears to have gradually hellenised a town originally Phœnician and Assyrian; contributing, along with the other Grecian settlements (Phasêlis, Aspendus, and Sidê) on the southern coast of Asia Minor, to narrow the Phœnician range of adventure in that direction.[2]

Such was the manner in which the Phœnicians found themselves affected by the Greek settlements. And if the Ionians of Asia Minor, when first conquered by Harpagus and the Persians, had followed the advice of the Prienean Bias to emigrate in a body and found one great Pan-Ionic colony in the island of Sardinia, these early merchants would have experienced the like hindrance[3] carried still farther westward—perhaps indeed the whole subsequent history of Carthage might have been sensibly modified.

Iberia and Tartêssus—unvisited by the Greeks before about 630 B.C.

But Iberia, and the golden region of Tartêssus, remained comparatively little visited, and still less colonised, by the Greeks; nor did it even become known to them, until more than a century after their first settlements had been formed in Sicily. Easy as the voyage from Corinth to Cadiz may now appear to us, to a Greek of the seventh or sixth centuries B.C. it was a formidable undertaking. He was under the necessity of first coasting along Akarnania and Epirus, then crossing, first to the island of Korkyra, and next to the Gulf of Tarentum. Proceeding to double the southernmost cape of Italy, he followed the sinuosities of the Mediterranean coast, by Tyrrhenia, Liguria, Southern Gaul and Eastern Iberia, to the Pillars of Hêraklês or Strait of Gibraltar: or if he did not do this, he had the alternative of crossing the open sea from Krête or Peloponnêsus to Libya, and then coasting westward along the perilous coast of the Syrtes until he arrived at the same point. Both voyages presented

[1] Respecting the worship at Salamis (in Cyprus) and Paphos, see Lactant. i. 21; Strabo, xiv. p. 683.

[2] Tarsus is mentioned by Dio Chrysostom as a colony from the Phœnician Arâdus (Orat. Tarsens. ii. p. 20, ed. Reisk.), and Herodotus makes Kilix brother of Phœnix and son of Agênôr (vii. 92).

Phœnician coins of the city of Tarsus are found, of a date towards the end of the Persian empire: see Movers, Die Phönizier, i. p. 13.

[3] Herodot. i. 170.

difficulties hard to be encountered; but the most serious hazard of all was the direct transit across the open sea from Krête to Libya. It was about the year 630 B.C. that the inhabitants of the island of Thêra, starved out by a seven years' drought, were enjoined by the Delphian god to found a colony in Libya. Nothing short of the divine command would have induced them to obey so terrific a sentence of banishment; for not only was the region named quite unknown to them, but they could not discover, by the most careful inquiries among practised Greek navigators, a single man who had ever intentionally made the voyage to Libya.[1] One Kretan only could they find—a fisherman named Korôbius—who had been driven thither accidentally by violent gales, and he served them as guide.

At this juncture Egypt had only been recently opened to Greek commerce—Psammetichus having been the first king who partially relaxed the jealous exclusion of ships from the entrance of the Nile, enforced by all his predecessors. The incitement of so profitable a traffic emboldened some Ionian traders to make the direct voyage from Krête to the mouth of that river. It was in the prosecution of one of these voyages, and in connexion with the foundation of Kyrênê (to be recounted in a future chapter), that we are made acquainted with the memorable adventure of the Samian merchant Kôlæus. While bound for Egypt, he had been driven out of his course by contrary winds and had found shelter on an uninhabited islet called Platea, off the coast of Libya—the spot where the emigrants intended for Kyrênê first established themselves, not long afterwards. From hence he again started to proceed to Egypt, but again without success; violent and continuous east winds drove him continually to the westward, until he at length passed the Pillars of Hêraklês, and found himself, under the providential guidance of the gods,[2] an unexpected visitor among the Phœnicians and Iberians of Tartêssus. What the cargo was which he was transporting to Egypt, we are not told. But it sold in this yet virgin market for the most exorbitant prices. He and his crew (says Herodotus[3]) "realised

Memorable voyage of the Samian Kôlæus to Tartêssus.

[1] Herodot. iv. 151.

[2] Herodot. iv. 152. Θειῇ πομπῇ χρεώμενος.

[3] Herodot. iv. 152. Τὸ δὲ ἐμπόριον τοῦτο (Tartêssus) ἦν ἀκήρατον τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον· ὥστε ἀπονοστήσαντες οὗτοι

a profit larger than ever fell to the lot of any known Greek except Sostratus the Æginetan, with whom no one else can compete". The magnitude of their profits may be gathered from the votive offering which they erected on their return in the sacred precinct of Hêrê at Samos, in gratitude for the protection of that goddess during their voyage. It was a large bronze vase, ornamented with projecting griffins' heads and supported by three bronze kneeling figures of colossal stature: it cost six talents, and represented the tithe of their gains. The aggregate of sixty talents[1] (about £16,000, speaking roughly), corresponding to this tithe, was a sum which not many even of the rich men of Athens in her richest time could boast of possessing.

To the lucky accident of this enormous vase and the inscription doubtless attached to it, which Herodotus saw in the Hêræon at Samos, and to the impression which such miraculous enrichment made upon his imagination, we are indebted for our knowledge of the precise period at which the secret of Phœnician commerce at Tartêssus first became known to the Greeks. The voyage of Kôlæus opened to the Greeks of that day a new world hardly less important (regard being had to their previous aggregate of knowledge) than the discovery of America to the Europeans of the last half of the fifteenth century. But Kôlæus did little more than make known the existence of this distant and lucrative region: he cannot be said to have shown the way to it. Nor do we find, in spite of the foundation of Kyrênê and Barka, which made the Greeks so much more familiar with the coast of Libya than they had been before, that the route, by which he had been carried against his own will, was ever deliberately pursued by Greek traders.

Probably the Carthaginians, altogether unscrupulous in pro-

ὀπίσω, μέγιστα δὴ Ἑλλήνων πάντων, τῶν ἡμεῖς ἀτρεκίην ἴδμεν, ἐκ φορτίων ἐκέρδησαν, μετά γε Σώστρατον τὸν Δαοδάμαντος, Αἰγινήτην· τούτῳ γὰρ οὐκ οἷά τέ ἐστι ἐρίσαι ἄλλον.

Allusions to the prodigious wealth of Tartêssus are found in Anakreôn, Fragm. 8, ed. Bergk; Stephan. Byz. Ταρτησσός; Eustath. ad Dionys. Periêgêt. 332, Ταρτησσὸς, ἣν καὶ ὁ Ἀνακρέων φησὶ πανευδαίμονα; Himerius ap. Photium, Cod. 243, p. 599—Ταρτησσοῦ βίον, Ἀμαλθείας κέρας, πᾶν ὅσον εὐδαιμονίας κεφαλαῖον.

[1] These talants cannot have been Attic talents; for the Attic talent first arose from the debasement of the Athenian money standard by Solôn, which did not occur until a generation after the voyage of Kôlæus. They must have been either Euboic or Æginæan talents; probably the former, seeing that the case belongs to the island of Samos. Sixty Euboic talents would be about equivalent to the sum stated in the text. For the proportion of the various Greek monetary scales see above, part 2, ch. iv. and ch. xii.

ceedings against commercial rivals,[1] would have aggravated its natural maritime difficulties by false information and hostile proceedings. The simple report of such gains, however, was well-calculated to act as a stimulus to other enterprising navigators. The Phôkæans, during the course of the next half-century, pushing their exploring voyages both along the Adriatic and along the Tyrrhenian coast, and founding Massalia in the year 600 B.C., at length reached the Pillars of Hêraklês and Tartêssus along the eastern coast of Spain. These men were the most adventurous mariners[2] that Greece had yet produced, creating a jealous uneasiness even among their Ionian neighbours.[3] Their voyages were made, not with round and bulky merchant ships, calculated only for the maximum of cargo, but with armed pentekonters—and they were thus enabled to defy the privateers of the Tyrrhenian cities on the Mediterranean, which had long deterred the Greek trader from any habitual traffic near the Strait of Messina.[4] There can be little doubt that the progress of the Phôkæans was very slow, and the foundation of Massalia (Marseilles), one of the most remote of all Greek colonies, may for a time have absorbed their attention: moreover they had to pick up information as they went on, and the voyage was one of discovery, in the strict sense of the word. The time at which they reached Tartêssus may seemingly be placed between 570—560 B.C. They made themselves so acceptable to Arganthônius—king of Tartêssus, or at least king of part of that region—that he urged them to relinquish their city of Phôkæa and establish themselves in his territory, offering to them any site which they chose to occupy. Though they declined this tempting offer, yet he still continued anxious to aid them against dangers at home, and gave them a large donation of money—whereby they were enabled at a critical moment to complete their fortifications. Arganthônius died shortly afterwards, having lived (we are told)

Exploring voyages of the Phôkæans, between 630—570 B.C.

[1] Strabo, xvii. p. 802; Aristot. Mirab. Ausc. c. 84—132.

[2] Herodot. i. 163. Οἱ δὲ Φωκαιέες οὗτοι ναυτιλίῃσι μακρῇσι πρῶτοι Ἑλλήνων ἐχρήσαντο· καὶ τόν τε Ἀδρίην καὶ τὴν Τυρσηνίην καὶ τὴν Ἰβηρίην καὶ τὸν Ταρτησσὸν οὗτοί εἰσι οἱ καταδέξαντες· ἐναυτίλλοντο δὲ οὐ στρογγύλῃσι νηυσὶν, ἀλλὰ πεντηκοντέροισι—the expressions are remarkable.

[3] Herodot. i. 164, 165, gives an example of the jealousy of the Chians in respect to the islands called Œnussæ.

[4] Ephorus, Fragm. 52, ed. Marx; Strabo, vi. p. 267.

to the extraordinary age of 120 years, of which he had reigned 80. The Phôkæans had probably reason to repent of their refusal: since in no very long time their town having been taken by the Persians, half their citizens became exiles, and were obliged to seek a precarious abode in Corsica, in place of the advantageous settlement which old Arganthônius had offered to them in Tartêssus.[1]

Important addition to Grecian geographical knowledge, and stimulus to Grecian fancy, thus communicated.

By such steps did the Greeks gradually track out the lines of Phœnician commerce in the Mediterranean, and accomplish that vast improvement in their geographical knowledge—the circumnavigation of what Eratosthenês and Strabo termed "our sea," as distinguished from the external Ocean.[2] Little practical advantage however was derived from the discovery, which was only made during the last years of Ionian independence. The Ionian cities became subjects of Persia, and Phôkæa especially was crippled and half-depopulated in the struggle. Had the period of Ionian enterprise been prolonged, we should probably have heard of other Greek settlements in Iberia and Tartêssus,—over and above Emporia and Rhodus, formed by the Massaliots between the Pyrenees and the Ebro,—as well as of increasing Grecian traffic with those regions. The misfortunes of Phôkæa and the other Ionic towns saved the Phœnicians of Tartêssus from Grecian interference and competition, such as that which their fellow-countrymen in Sicily had been experiencing for a century and a half.

But though the Ephesian Artemis, the divine protectress of Phôkæan emigration, was thus prevented from becoming consecrated in Tartêssus, along with the Tyrian Hêraklês, an impulse not the less powerful was given to the imaginations of philosophers like Thalês and poets like Stesichorus—whose lives cover the interval between the supernatural transport of Kôlæus on the wings of the winds, and the persevering, well-planned, exploration which emanated from Phôkæa. While, on the one hand, the Tyrian Hêraklês with his venerated temple at Gadês furnished a new locality and details for mythes respecting the Grecian Hêraklês—on the other hand, intelligent Greeks learnt for the

[1] Herodot. i. 165.

[2] Ἡ καθ' ἡμᾶς θάλασσα (Strabo); τῆσδε τῆς θαλάττης (Herodot. iv. 41).

first time that the waters surrounding their island and the Peloponnêsus formed part of a sea circumscribed by assignable boundaries. Continuous navigation of the Phôkæans round the coasts, first of the Adriatic, next of the Gulf of Lyons to the Pillars of Hêraklês and Tartêssus, first brought to light this important fact. The hearers of Archilochus, Simonidês of Amorgus, and Kallinus, living before or contemporary with the voyage of Kôlæus, had no known sea-limit either north of Korkyra or west of Sicily: but those of Anakreôn and Hippônax, a century afterwards, found the Euxine, the Palus Mæôtis, the Adriatic, the Western Mediterranean, and the Libyan Syrtes, all so far surveyed as to present to the mind a definite conception, and to admit of being visibly represented by Anaximander on a map. However familiar such knowledge has now become to us, at the time now under discussion it was a prodigious advance. The Pillars of Hêraklês, especially, remained deeply fixed in the Greek mind, as a terminus of human adventure and aspiration: of the Ocean beyond, men were for the most part content to remain ignorant.

Circumnavigation of Africa by the Phœnicians.

It has already been stated that the Phœnicians, as coast explorers, were even more enterprising than the Phôkæans. But their jealous commercial spirit induced them to conceal their track,—to give information designedly false[1] respecting dangers and difficulties,—and even to drown any commercial rivals when they could do so with safety.[2] One remarkable Phœnician achievement, however, contemporary with the period of Phôkæan exploration, must not be passed over. It was somewhere about 600 B.C. that they circumnavigated Africa; starting from the Red Sea, by direction of the Egyptian king Nekôs, son of Psammetichus—going round the Cape of Good Hope to Gadês—and from thence returning to the Nile.

It appears that Nekôs, anxious to procure a water-communication between the Red Sea and the Mediterranean, began digging a canal from the former to the Nile, but desisted from the undertaking after having made considerable progress. In

[1] The geographer Ptolemy, with genuine scientific zeal, complains bitterly of the reserve and frauds common with the old traders, respecting the countries which they visited (Ptolem. Geogr. i. 11).

[2] Strabo, iii. p. 175, 176; xvii. p. 802.

prosecution of the same object, he despatched these Phœnicians on an experimental voyage from the Red Sea round Libya, which was successfully accomplished, though in a time not less than three years; for during each autumn the mariners landed and remained on shore a sufficient time to sow their seed and raise a crop of corn. They reached Egypt again through the Strait of Gibraltar, in the course of the third year, and recounted a tale—"which (says Herodotus) others may perhaps believe, but I cannot believe"—that in sailing round Libya they had the sun on their right hand, *i.e.* to the north.[1]

This circumnavigation was really accomplished—doubts of critics, ancient and modern, examined.

The reality of this circumnavigation was confirmed to Herodotus by various Carthaginian informants,[2] and he himself fully believes it. There seems good reason for sharing in his belief, though several able critics reject the tale as incredible. The Phœnicians were expert and daring masters of coast navigation, and in going round Africa they had no occasion ever to lose sight of land. We may presume that their vessels were amply stored, so that they could take their own time, and lie by in bad weather; we may also take for granted that the reward consequent upon success was considerable. For any other mariners then existing, indeed, the undertaking might have been too hard, but it was not so for them, and that was the reason why Nekôs chose them. To such reasons, which show the story to present no intrinsic incredibility (that indeed is hardly alleged even by Mannert and others who disbelieve it), we may add one other, which goes far to prove it positively true. They stated that in the course of their circuit, while going westward, they

[1] Herodot. iv. 42. Καὶ ἔλεγον, ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐ πιστὰ, ἄλλῳ δὲ δή τεῳ, ὡς περιπλώοντες τὴν Διβύην τὸν ἥλιον ἔσχον ἐς τὰ δεξιά.

[2] Herodot. iv. 43. Οὕτω μὲν αὕτη ἐγνώσθη τὸ πρῶτον (*i.e.* ἡ Διβύη ἐγνώσθη ἐοῦσα περίῤῥυτος)· μετὰ δὲ, Καρχηδόνιοι εἰσι οἱ λέγοντες. These Carthaginians, to whom Herodotus here alludes, told him that Libya was circumnavigable; but it does not seem that they knew of any other actual circumnavigation except that of the Phœnicians sent by Nekôs; otherwise Herodotus would have made some allusion to it, instead of proceeding, as he does immediately, to tell the story of the Persian Satastês, who tried and failed.

The testimony of the Carthaginians is so far valuable, as it declares their persuasion of the truth of the statement made by those Phœnicians.

Some critics have construed the words, in which Herodotus alludes to the Carthaginians as his informants, as if what they told him was the story of the fruitless attempt made by Sataspês. But this is evidently not the meaning of the historian: he brings forward the opinion of the Carthaginians as confirmatory of the statement made by the Phœnicians employed by Nekôs.

had the sun on their right hand (*i.e.* to the northward); and this phænomenon, observable according to the season even when they were within the tropics, could not fail to bring itself on their attention as constant, after they had reached the southern temperate zone. But Herodotus at once pronounces this part of the story to be incredible, and so it might appear to almost every man, Greek,[1] Phœnician, or Egyptian, not only of the age of Nekôs, but even of the time of Herodotus, who heard it; since none of them possessed either actual experience of the phænomena of a southern latitude, or a sufficiently correct theory of the relation between sun and earth, to understand the varying direction of the shadows; and few men would consent to set aside the received ideas with reference to the solar motions, from pure confidence in the veracity of these Phœnician narrators. Now that under such circumstances the latter should invent the tale is highly improbable; and if they were not inventors, they must have experienced the phænomenon during the southern portion of their transit.

Some critics disbelieve this circumnavigation, from supposing that if so remarkable an achievement had really taken place once, it must have been repeated, and practical application must have been made of it. But though such a suspicion is not unnatural, with those who recollect how great a revolution was operated when the passage was rediscovered during the fifteenth century, yet the reasoning will not be found applicable to the sixth century before the Christian æra.

Pure scientific curiosity, in that age, counted for nothing. The motive of Nekôs for directing this enterprise was the same as that which had prompted him to dig his canal,—in order that he might procure the best communication between the Mediterranean and the Red Sea. But, as it has been with the north-west passage in our time, so it was with the circumnavigation of Africa in his—the proof of its practicability at the same time showed that it was not available for purposes of traffic or communication, looking to the resources then at the command of navigators—a fact, however, which could not be known until the experiment was made. To pass from the Mediterranean to the Red Sea by

[1] Diodôrus (iii. 40) talks correct language about the direction of the shadows southward of the tropic of Cancer (compare Pliny, H. N. vi. 29)—one mark of the extension of geographical and astronomical observations during the four intervening centuries between him and Herodotus.

means of the Nile still continued to be the easiest way; either by aid of the land journey, which in the times of the Ptolemies was usually made from Koptos on the Nile to Berenikê on the Red Sea—or by means of the canal of Nekôs, which Darius afterwards finished, though it seems to have been neglected during the Persian rule in Egypt, and was subsequently repaired and put to service under the Ptolemies. Without any doubt the successful Phœnician mariners underwent both severe hardship and great real perils, besides those still greater supposed perils, the apprehension of which so constantly unnerved the minds even of experienced and resolute men in the unknown Ocean. Such was the force of these terrors and difficulties, to which there was no known termination, upon the mind of the Achæmenid Sataspês (upon whom the circumnavigation of Africa was imposed as a penalty "worse than death" by Xerxês, in commutation of a capital sentence), that he returned without having finished the circuit, though by so doing he forfeited his life. He affirmed that he had sailed "until his vessel stuck fast, and could move on no farther"—a persuasion not uncommon in ancient times and even down to Columbus, that there was a point, beyond which the Ocean, either from mud, sands, shallows, fogs, or accumulations of sea-weed, was no longer navigable.[1]

[1] Skylax, after following the line of coast from the Mediterranean outside of the Strait of Gibraltar, and then south-westward along Africa as far as the island of Kernê, goes on to say, that "beyond Kernê the sea is no longer navigable from shallows and mud and sea-weed"—Τῆς δὲ Κέρνης *νήσου τὰ ἐπέκεινα οὐκέτι ἐστὶ πλωτὰ διὰ βραχύτητα θαλάττης καὶ πηλὸν καὶ φῦκος. ἐστὶ δὲ τὸ φῦκος τῆς δοχμῆς τὸ πλάτος καὶ ἄνωθεν ὀξύ, ὥστε κεντεῖν* (Skylax, c. 109). Nearchus, on undertaking his voyage down the Indus and from thence into the Persian Gulf, is not certain whether the external sea will be found navigable—*εἰ δὲ πλωτός γέ ἐστιν ὁ ταύτῃ πόντος* (Nearchi Periplus, p. 2: compare p. 40 ap. Geogr. Minor. vol. i. ed. Hudson). Pytheas described the neighbourhood of Thulê as a sort of chaos—a medley of earth, sea, and air in which you could neither walk nor sail—*οὔτε γῇ καθ' αὑτὴν ὑπερχεν οὔτε θάλασσα οὔτε ἀήρ, ἀλλὰ σύγκριμά τε ἐκ τούτων πλεύμονι θαλασσίῳ ἐοικὸς, ἐν ᾧ φησὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν αἰωρεισσαι καὶ τὰ σύμπαντα, καὶ τοῦτον ὡς ἂν δεσμὸν εἶναι τῶν ὅλων, μήτε πορευτὸν μήτε πλωτὸν ὑπάρχοντα· τὸ μὲν οὖν τῷ πλεύμονι ἐοικὸς αὐτὸς* (Pytheas) *ὡρακέναι, τἆλλα δὲ λέγειν ἐξ ἀκοῆς* (Strabo, ii. p. 104). Again, the priests of Memphis told Herodotus that their conquering hero Sesostris had equipped a fleet in the Arabian Gulf, and made a voyage into the Erythræan Sea, subjugating people everywhere, "until he came to a sea no longer navigable from shallows"—*οὐκέτι πλωτὴν ὑπὸ βραχέων* (Herod. ii. 109). Plato represents the sea without the Pillars of Hêraklês as impenetrable and unfit for navigation, in consequence of the large admixture of earth, mud, or vegetable covering, which had arisen in it from the disruption of the great island or continent Atlantis (Timæus, p. 25; and Kritias, p. 108); which passages are well-illustrated by the Scholiast, who seems to have read geographical descriptions of the character of this outer sea—*τοῦτο καὶ οἱ τοὺς ἐκείνῃ τόπους ἱστοροῦντες λέγουσιν, ὡς πάντα σεναγώδη τὸν ἐκεῖ*

Now we learn from hence that the enterprise, even by those who believed the narrative of Nekôs's captains, was regarded as at once desperate and unprofitable; but doubtless many persons

εἶναι χῶρον· τέναγος δὲ ἐστὶν ἰλύς τις, ἐπιπολάζοντος ὕδατος οὐ πολλοῦ, καὶ βοτάνης ἐπιφαινομένης τούτῳ. See also Plutarch's fancy of the dense, earthy, and viscous Kronian sea (some days to the westward of Britain), in which a ship could with difficulty advance, and only by means of severe pulling with the oars (Plutarch, De Facie in Orbe Lunæ, c. 26, p. 941). So again in the two geographical productions in verse by Rufus Festus Avienus (Hudson, Geogr. Minor. vol. iv., Descriptio Orbis Terræ, v. 57, and Ora Maritima, v. 406—415); in the first of these two, the density of the water of the Western Ocean is ascribed to its being saturated with salt—in the second, we have shallows, large quantities of sea-weed, and wild beasts swimming about, which the Carthaginian Himilco affirmed himself to have seen:

"Plerumque porro tenue tenditur salum,
Ut vix arenas subjacentes occulat;
Exsuperat autem gurgitem fucus frequens
Atque impeditur æstus ex uligine:
Vis vel ferarum pelagus omne internatat,
Mutusque terror ex feris habitat freta.
Hæc olim Himilco Pœnus Oceano super
*Spectasse* semet et probasse rettulit:
Hæc nos, ab imis Punicorum annalibus
Prolata longo tempore, edidimus tibi."

Compare also v. 115—130 of the same poem, where the author again quotes from a voyage of Himilco, who had been four months in the ocean outside of the Pillars of Hercules:—

"Sic nulla late flabra propellunt ratem,
Sic segnis humor æquoris pigri stupet,
Adjicit et illud, plurimum inter gurgites
Extare fucum, et sæpe virgulti vice
Retinere puppim," &c.

The dead calm, mud, and shallows of the external ocean are touched upon by Aristot. Meteorolog. ii. 1, 14, and seem to have been a favourite subject of declamation with the rhetors of the Augustan age. See Seneca, Suasoriar. i. 1.

Even the companions and contemporaries of Columbus, when navigation had made such comparative progress, still retained much of these fears respecting the dangers and difficulties of the unknown ocean:—"Le tableau exagéré (observes A. von Humboldt, Examen Critique de l'Histoire de la Géographie, t. iii. p. 95) que la ruse des Phéniciens avait tracé des difficultés qu'opposaient à la navigation au delà des Colonnes d'Hercule, de Cerné, et de l'Ile Sacrée (Ierné), le fucus, le limon, le manque de fond, et le calme perpétuel de la mer, ressemble d'une manière frappante aux récits animés des premiers compagnons de Colomb".

Columbus was the first man who traversed the sea of Sargasso, or area of the Atlantic Ocean south of the Azores, where it is covered by an immense mass of sea-weed for a space six or seven times as large as France: the alarm of his crew at this unexpected spectacle was considerable. The sea-weed is sometimes so thickly accumulated, that it requires a considerable wind to impel the vessel through it. The remarks and comparisons of M. von Humboldt in reference to ancient and modern navigation are highly interesting (Examen, *ut sup.* pp. 69, 88, 91, &c.).

J. M. Gesner (Dissertat. de Navigationibus extra Columnas Herculis, sect. 6 and 7) has a good defence of the story told by Herodotus. Major Rennell also adopts the same view, and shows by many arguments how much easier the circumnavigation was from the East than from the West (Geograph. System of Herodotus, p. 680): compare Ukert, Geograph. der Griechen und Römer, vol. i. p. 61; Mannert, Geog. d. G. und Römer, vol. i. p. 19—26. Gossellin (Recherches sur la Géogr. des Anc. i. p. 149) and Mannert both reject the story as not worthy of belief: Heeren defends it (Ideen über den Verkehr der Alten Welt, i. 2, p. 86—95).

Agatharchides, in the second century B.C., pronounces the eastern coast of Africa, southward of the Red Sea, to be as yet unexamined: he treats it as a matter of certainty however that the sea to the south-westward is continuous with the Western Ocean (De Rubro Mari, Geogr. Minores, ed. Huds. v. i. p. 11).

treated it as a mere "Phœnician lie"[1] (to use an expression proverbial in ancient times). The circumnavigation of Libya is said to have been one of the projects conceived by Alexander the Great.[2] We may readily believe that if he had lived longer, it would have been confided to Nearchus or some other officer of the like competence, and in all probability would have succeeded, especially since it would have been undertaken from the eastward —to the great profit of geographical knowledge among the ancients, but with little advantage to their commerce. There is then adequate reason for admitting that these Phœnicians rounded the Cape of Good Hope from the East about 600 B.C., more than 2000 years earlier than Vasco da Gama did the same thing from the West; though the discovery was in the first instance of no avail, either for commerce or for geographical science.

Besides the maritime range of Tyre and Sidon, their trade by

[1] Strabo, iii. p. 170. Sataspês (the unsuccessful Persian circumnavigator of Libya, mentioned just above) had violated the daughter of another Persian nobleman, Zopyrus son of Megabyzus, and Xerxês had given orders that he should be crucified for this act: his mother begged him off by suggesting that he should be condemned to something "*worse than death*"—the circumnavigation of Libya (Herod. iv. 43). Two things are to be remarked in respect to his voyage:—1. He took with him a ship and seamen from Egypt; we are not told that they were Phœnician; probably no other mariners than Phœnicians were competent to such a voyage—and even if the crew of Sataspês had been Phœnicians, he could not offer rewards for success equal to those at the disposal of Nekôs. 2. He began his enterprise from the Strait of Gibraltar instead of from the Red Sea; now it seems that the current between Madagascar and the eastern coast of Africa sets very strongly towards the Cape of Good Hope, so that while it greatly assists the southerly voyage, on the other hand, it makes return by the same way very difficult. (See Humboldt, Examen Critique de l'Histoire de la Géographie, t. i. p. 343.) Strabo, however, affirms that all those who had tried to circumnavigate Africa, both from the Red Sea and from the Strait of Gibraltar, had been forced to return without success (i. p. 32), so that most people believed that there was a continuous isthmus which rendered it impracticable to go by sea from the one point to the other; he is himself, however, persuaded that the Atlantic is συῤῥους on both sides of Africa, and therefore that circumnavigation is possible. He as well as Poseidonius (ii. p. 98—100) disbelieved the tale of the Phœnicians sent by Nekôs. He must have derived his complete conviction, that Libya might be circumnavigated, from geographical theory, which led him to contract the dimensions of that continent southward—inasmuch as the thing in his belief never had been done, though often attempted. Mannert (Geog. d. G. und Röm. i. p. 24) erroneously says that Strabo and others founded their belief on the narrative of Herodotus.

It is worth while remarking that Strabo cannot have read the story in Herodotus with much attention, since he mentions Darius as the king who sent the Phœnicians round Africa, not Nekôs; nor does he take notice of the remarkable statement of these navigators respecting the position of the sun. There were doubtless many apocryphal narratives current in his time respecting attempts, successful and unsuccessful, to circumnavigate Africa, as we may see by the tale of Eudoxus (Strabo, ii. 98; Cornel. Nep. ap. Plin. H. N. ii. 67, who gives the story very differently; and Pomp. Mela, iii. 9).

[2] Arrian. Exp. Al. vii. 1, 2.

land in the interior of Asia was of great value and importance. They were the speculative merchants who directed the march of the caravans laden with Assyrian and Egyptian products across the deserts which separated them from inner Asia[1]—an operation which presented hardly less difficulties, considering the Arabian depredators whom they were obliged to conciliate and even to employ as carriers, than the longest coast voyage. They seem to have stood alone in antiquity in their willingness to brave, and their ability to surmount, the perils of a distant land-traffic;[2] and their descendants at Carthage and Utica were not less active in pushing caravans far into the interior of Africa.

Caravan-trade by land carried on by the Phœnicians.

[1] Herodot. i. 1. Φοίνικας—ἀπαγινέοντας φόρτια Ἀσσύρια τε καὶ Αἰγύπτια.

[2] See the valuable chapter in Heeren (Ueber den Verkehr der Alten Welt, i. 2, Abschn. 4, p. 96) about the land trade of the Phœnicians.

The twenty-seventh chapter of the Prophet Ezekiel presents a striking picture of the general commerce of Tyre.

# CHAPTER XIX.

## ASSYRIANS—BABYLON.

Assyrians—their name rests chiefly on Nineveh and Babylon.

THE name of the Assyrians, who formed one wing of this early system of intercourse and commerce, rests chiefly upon the great cities of Nineveh and Babylon. To the Assyrians of Nineveh (as has been already mentioned) is ascribed in early times a very extensive empire, covering much of Upper Asia, as well as Mesopotamia or the country between the Euphrates and the Tigris. Respecting this empire—its commencement, its extent, or even the mode in which it was put down—nothing certain can be affirmed. But it seems unquestionable that many great and flourishing cities—and a population inferior in enterprise, but not in industry, to the Phœnicians—were to be found on the Euphrates and Tigris, in times anterior to the first Olympiad. Of these cities, Nineveh on the Tigris and Babylon on the Euphrates were the chief,[1] the latter being in some sort of dependence, probably, on the sovereigns of Nineveh, yet governed by kings or chiefs of its own, and comprehending an hereditary order of priests named Chaldæans, masters of all the science and literature as well as of the religious ceremonies current among the people, and devoted from very early times to that habit of astronomical observation which their brilliant sky so much favoured.

The people called Assyrians or Syrians (for among the Greek authors no constant distinction is maintained between the two[2])

[1] Herodot. i. 178. Τῆς δὲ Ἀσσυρίης ἐστὶ μέν κου καὶ ἄλλα πολίσματα μεγάλα πολλά· τὸ δὲ ὀνομαστότατον καὶ ἰσχυρότατον, καὶ ἐνθα σφι, τῆς Νίνου ἀναστάτου γενομένης, τὰ βασιλήϊα κατεστήκεε, ἦν Βαβυλών.

The existence of these and several other great cities is an important item to be taken in, in our conception of the old Assyria: Opis on the Tigris, and Sittakê very near the Tigris, were among them (Xenoph. Anab. ii. 4, 13—25): compare Diodor. ii. 11.

[2] Herodot. i. 72; iii. 90—91; vii. 63: Strabo. xvi. p. 736, also ii. p. 84, in which he takes exception to the dis-

were distributed over the wide territory bounded on the east by Mount Zagros and its north-westerly continuation towards Mount Ararat, by which they were separated from the Medes—and extending from thence westward and southward to the Euxine Sea, the river Halys, the Mediterranean Sea and the Persian Gulf —thus covering the whole course of the Tigris and Euphrates south of Armenia, as well as Syria and Syria-Palæstine, and the territory eastward of the Halys called Kappadokia. But the Chaldæan order of priests appears to have been peculiar to Babylon and other towns in its territory, especially between that city and the Persian Gulf. The vast, rich, and lofty temple of Bêlus in that city served them at once as a place of worship and an astronomical observatory. It was the paramount ascendency of this order which seems to have caused the Babylonian people generally to be spoken of as Chaldæans—though some writers have supposed, without any good proof, a conquest of Assyrian Babylon by barbarians called Chaldæans from the mountains near the Euxine.[1]

Chaldæans at Babylon —order of priests.

There were exaggerated statements respecting the antiquity of their astronomical observations, which cannot be traced as of definite and recorded date higher than the æra of Nabonassar[2] (747 B.C.), as well as respecting

Their astronomical observations.

tribution of the οἰκουμένη (inhabited portion of the globe) made by Eratosthenês, because it did not include in the same compartment (σφραγίς) Syria proper and Mesopotamia; he calls Ninus and Semiramis, Syrians. Herodotus considers the Armenians as colonists from the Phrygians (vii. 73).

The Homeric names Ἀρίμοι, Ἐρεμβοί (the first in the Iliad, ii. 783, the second in the Odyssey, iv. 84) coincide with the Oriental name of this race *Aram*: it seems more ancient in the Greek habits of speech than *Syrians* (see Strabo, xvi. p. 785).

The Hesiodic Catalogue too, as well as Stêsichorus, recognised *Arabus* as the sons of Hermês by Thronié daughter of Bêlus (Hesiod, Frag. 29, ed. Marktscheffel; Strabo, i. p. 42).

[1] Heeren, in his account of the Babylonians (Ideen über den Verkehr der Alten Welt, part i. Abtheilung 2, p. 168), speaks of this conquest of Babylon by Chaldæan barbarians from the northern mountains as a certain fact, explaining the great development of the Babylonian empire under Nabopolasar and Nebuchadnezzar from 630—580 B.C.; it was (he thinks) the new Chaldæan conquerors who thus extended their dominion over Judæa and Phœnicia.

I agree with Volney (Chronologie des Babyloniens, ch. x. p. 215) in thinking this statement both unsupported and improbable. Mannert seems to suppose the Chaldæans of Arabian origin (Geogr. der G. und Röm., part v. s. 2, ch. xii. p. 419). The passages of Strabo (xvi. p. 739) are more favourable to this opinion than to that of Heeren; but we make out nothing distinct respecting the Chaldæans except that they were the priestly order among the Assyrians of Babylon, as they are expressly termed by Herodotus—ὡς λέγουσι οἱ Χαλδαῖοι, ἐόντες τούτου τοῦ θεοῦ (of Zeus Bêlus) (Herodot. i. 181).

[2] The earliest Chaldæan astronomical observation, known to the astronomer Ptolemy, both precise and of ascertained date to a degree sufficient

the extent of their acquired knowledge, so largely blended with astrological fancies and occult influences of the heavenly bodies on human affairs. But however incomplete their knowledge may appear when judged by the standard of after-times, there can be

for scientific use, was a lunar eclipse of the 19th March, 721 B.C.—the 27th year of the æra of Nabonassar (Ideler, Ueber die Astronomischen Beobachtungen der Alten, p. 19, Berlin, 1806). Had Ptolemy known any older observations conforming to these conditions, he would not have omitted to notice them: his own words in the Almagest testify how much he valued the knowledge and comparison of observations taken at distant intervals (Almagest, b. 3, p. 62, ap. Ideler, *l. c.* p. 1), and at the same time imply that he had none more ancient than the æra of Nabonassar (Alm. iii. p. 77, ap. Idel. p. 169).

That the Chaldæans had been, long before this period, in the habit of observing the heavens, there is no reason to doubt; and the exactness of those observations cited by Ptolemy implies (according to the judgment of Ideler, *ib.* p. 167) long previous practice. The period of 223 lunations, after which the moon reverts nearly to the same positions in reference to the apsides and nodes, and after which eclipses return nearly in the same order and magnitude, appears to have been discovered by the Chaldæans ("Defectus ducentis viginti tribus mensibus redire in suos orbes certum est," Pliny, H. N. ii. 13), and they deduced from hence the mean daily motions of the moon with a degree of accuracy which differs only by four seconds from modern lunar tables (Geminus, Isagoge in Arati Phænomena, c. 15: Ideler, *l. c.* pp. 153, 154, and in his Handbuch der Chronologie, vol. i. Absch. ii. p. 207).

There seem to have been Chaldæan observations, both made and recorded, of much greater antiquity than the æra of Nabonassar; though we cannot lay much stress on the date of 1903 years anterior to Alexander the Great, which is mentioned by Simplicius (ad Aristot. de Cœlo, p. 123) as being the earliest period of the Chaldæan observations sent from Babylon by Kallisthenês to Aristotle. Ideler thinks that the Chaldæan observations anterior to the æra of Nabonassar were useless to astronomers from the want of some fixed æra, or definite cycle, to identify the date of each of them. The common civil year of the Chaldæans had been from the beginning (like that of the Greeks) a lunar year, kept in a certain degree of harmony with the sun by cycles of lunar years and intercalation. Down to the æra of Nabonassar, the calendar was in confusion, and there was nothing to verify either the time of accession of the kings or that of astronomical phænomena observed, except the days and months of this lunar year. In the reign of Nabonassar the astronomers at Babylon introduced (not into civil use, but for their own purposes and records) the Egyptian solar year—of 365 days, or 12 months of thirty days each, with five added days, beginning with the first of the month Thoth, the commencement of the Egyptian year—and they thus first obtained a continuous and accurate mode of marking the date of events. It is not meant that the Chaldæans then for the first time obtained from the Egyptians the *knowledge* of the solar year of 365 days, but that they then for the first time adopted it in their notation of time for astronomical purposes, fixing the precise moment at which they began. Nor is there the least reason to suppose that the æra of Nabonassar coincided with any political revolution or change of dynasty. Ideler discusses this point (pp. 146—173, and Handbuch der Chronol. pp. 215—220). Syncellus might correctly say—'Ἀπὸ Νοβοναζάρου τοὺς χρόνους τῆς τῶν ἄστρων παρατηρήσεως Χαλδαῖοι ἠκρίβωσαν (Chronogr. p. 207).

We need not dwell upon the back reckonings of the Chaldæans for periods of 720,000, 490,000, 470,000 years, mentioned by Cicero, Diodôrus and Pliny (Cicero, De Divin. ii. 46; Diod. ii. 31; Pliny, H. N. vii. 57), and seemingly presented by Berosus and others as the preface of Babylonian history.

It is to be noted that Ptolemy always cited the Chaldæan observations as made by "*the Chaldæans*," never naming any individual; though in all the other observations to which he alludes, he is very scrupulous in particularising the name of the observer. Doubtless he found the Chal-

no doubt, that compared with any of their contemporaries of the sixth century B.C. (either Egyptians, Greeks, or Asiatics) they stood pre-eminent, and had much to teach, not only to Thalês and Pythagoras, but even to later inquirers, such as Eudoxus and Aristotle. The conception of the revolving celestial sphere, the gnomon, and the division of the day into twelve parts, are affirmed by Herodotus[1] to have been first taught to the Greeks by the Babylonians; and the continuous observation of the heavens both by the Egyptian and Chaldæan priests had determined with considerable exactness both the duration of the solar year and other longer periods of astronomical recurrence; thus impressing upon intelligent Greeks the imperfection of their own calendars, and furnishing them with a basis not only for enlarged observations of their own, but also for the discovery and application of those mathematical theories whereby astronomy first became a science.

It was not only the astronomical acquisitions of the priestly caste which distinguished the early Babylonians. The social condition, the fertility of the country, the dense population, and the persevering industry of the inhabitants were not less remarkable. Respecting Nineveh,[2] once the greatest of the Assyrian cities, we

Babylonia—its laborious cultivation and fertility.

dæan observations registered just in this manner; a point which illustrates what is said in the text respecting the collective character of their civilization, and the want of individual development or prominent genius.

The superiority of the Chaldæan priests to the Egyptian as astronomical observers is shown by the fact, that Ptolemy, though living at Alexandria, never mentions the latter as astronomers, nor cites any Egyptian observations; while he cites thirteen Chaldæan observations in the years B.C. 721, 720, 523, 502, 491, 383, 382, 245, 237, 229: the first ten being observations of lunar eclipses; the last three, of conjunctions of planets and fixed stars (Ideler, Handbuch der Chronologie, vol. i. Ab. ii. p. 195—199).

[1] Herodot. ii. 109.

[2] The ancient Ninus or Nineveh was situated on the eastern bank of the Tigris, nearly opposite the modern town of Mousul or Mosul. Herodotus (i. 193) and Strabo (xvi. p. 737) both speak of it as being destroyed; but Tacitus (Ann. xii. 13) and Ammian. Marcell. (xviii. 7) mention it as subsisting. Its ruins had been long remarked (see Thevenot, Voyages, liv. i. ch. xi. p. 176, and Niebuhr, Reisen, vol. ii. p. 360), but have never been examined carefully until recently by Rich, Layard, and others: see Ritter, West-Asien, b. iii. Abtheil. iii. Abschn. i. s. 45, p. 171—221; and Forbiger, Handbuch der Alten Geographie, s. 96, p. 612; and above all the interesting work of Mr. Layard, who has procured from the spot so many valuable remains of antiquity.

Ktêsias, according to Diodôrus (ii. 3), placed Ninus or Nineveh on the Euphrates, which we must presume to be an inadvertence—probably of Diodôrus himself, for Ktêsias would be less likely than he to confound the Euphrates and the Tigris. Compare Wesseling ad Diodôr. ii. 3, and Bähr ad Ktesiæ Fragm. ii. Assyr. p. 392.

have no good information, nor can we safely reason from the analogy of Babylon, inasmuch as the peculiarities of the latter were altogether determined by the Euphrates, while Nineveh was seated considerably farther north, and on the east bank of the Tigris. But Herodotus gives us valuable particulars respecting Babylon as an eye-witness. We may judge by his account, representing its condition after much suffering from the Persian conquest, what it had been a century earlier in the days of its full splendour.

The neighbouring territory, receiving but little rain,[1] owed its fertility altogether to the annual overflowing of the Euphrates, on which the labour bestowed, for the purpose of limiting, regularising, and diffusing its supply of water, was stupendous. Embankments along the river—artificial reservoirs in connexion with it to receive an excessive increase—new curvilinear channels dug for the water in places where the stream was too straight and rapid—broad and deep canals crossing the whole space between the Euphrates and the Tigris, and feeding numerous rivulets[2] or ditches which enabled the whole breadth of land to be irrigated—all these toilsome applications were requisite to ensure due moisture for the Babylonian soil. But they were rewarded with an exuberance of produce, in the various descriptions of grain, such as Herodotus hardly dares to particularise. The country produced no trees except the date-palm; which was turned to account in many different ways, and from the fruit of which, both copious and of extraordinary size, wine as well as bread was made.[3] Moreover, Babylonia was still more barren of

[1] Herodot. i. 193. Ἡ γῆ τῶν Ἀσσυρίων ὕεται μὲν ὀλίγῳ—while he speaks of rain falling at Thêbes in Egypt as a prodigy, which never happened except just at the moment when the country was conquered by Cambysês—οὐ γὰρ δὴ ὕεται τὰ ἄνω τῆς Αἰγύπτου τὸ παράπαν (iii. 10). It is not unimportant to notice this distinction between the *little* rain of Babylonia, and the *no* rain of Upper Egypt—as a mark of measured assertion in the historian from whom so much of our knowledge of Grecian history is derived.

It chanced to rain hard during the four days which the traveller Niebuhr spent in going from the ruins of Babylon to Bagdad, at the end of November, 1763 (Reisen, vol. ii. p. 292).

[2] Herodot. i. 193: Xenophôn, Anab. i. 7, 15; ii. 4, 13—22.

[3] About the date-palms (φοίνικες) in the ancient Babylonia, see Theophrastus, Hist. Plant. ii. 6, 2—6; Xenoph. Cyrop. vii. 5, 12; Anab. ii. 3, 15; Diodôr. ii. 53; there were some which bore no fruit, but which afforded good wood for house purposes and furniture.

Theophrastus gives the same general idea of the fertility and produce of the soil in Babylonia as Herodotus, though the two-hundred-fold, and sometimes three-hundred-fold, which was stated to the latter as the produce of the land in grain, appears in his statement cut

stone than of wood, so that buildings as well as walls were constructed almost entirely of brick, for which the earth was well adapted; while a flow of mineral bitumen, found near the town and river of Is, higher up the Euphrates, served for cement. Such persevering and systematic labour, applied for the purpose of irrigation, excites our astonishment; yet the description of what was done for defence is still more imposing. Babylon, traversed in the middle by the Euphrates, was surrounded by walls three hundred feet in height, seventy-five feet in thickness, and composing a square of which each side was one hundred and twenty stadia (or nearly fifteen English miles) in length. Around the outside of the walls was a broad and deep moat from whence the material for the bricks composing them had been excavated; while one hundred brazen gates served for ingress and egress. Besides, there was an interior wall less thick, but still very strong; and as a still farther obstruction to invaders from the north and north-east, another high and thick wall was built at some miles from the city, across the space between the Euphrates and the Tigris—called the wall of Media, seemingly a little to the north of that point where the two rivers most nearly approach to each other, and joining the Tigris on its west bank. Of the houses many were three or four stories high, and the broad and straight streets, unknown in a Greek town until the distribution of the Peiræeus by Hippodamus near the time of the Peloponnesian war, were well-calculated to heighten the astonishment raised by the whole spectacle in a visitor like Herodotus. The royal palace, with its memorable terraces or hanging gardens, formed the central and commanding edifice in one half of the city—the temple of Bêlus in the other half.

City of Babylon—its dimensions and walls.

That celebrated temple, standing upon a basis of one square stadium, and enclosed in a precinct of two square stadia in dimension, was composed of eight solid towers, built one above the other, and is alleged by Strabo to have been as much as a stadium or furlong high (the height is not specified by Herodotus[1]).

down to fifty-fold or one-hundred-fold (Hist. Plant. viii. 7, 4).

Respecting the numerous useful purposes for which the date-palm was made to serve (a Persian song enumerated three hundred and sixty), see Strabo, xvi. p. 742; Ammian. Marcell. xxiv. 3.

[1] Herodot. i. 178; Strabo, xvi. p. 738; Arrian, E. A. vii. 17, 7. Strabo

It was full of costly decorations, and possessed an extensive landed property. Along the banks of the river, in its passage through the city, were built spacious quays, and a bridge on stone piles—for the placing of which (as Herodotus was told) Semiramis had caused the river Euphrates to be drained off into the large side reservoir and lake constructed higher up its course.[1]

does not say that it was a stadium in *perpendicular* height: we may suppose that the stadium represents the entire distance in upward march from the bottom to the top. He as well as Arrian says that Xerxês destroyed both the temple of Bêlus, and all the other temples at Babylon (καθεῖλεν, κατέσκαψεν, iii. 16, 6; vii. 17, 4); he talks of the intention of Alexander to rebuild it, and of his directions given to level the foundation anew, carrying away the loose earth and ruins. This cannot be reconciled with the narrative of Herodotus, nor with the statement of Pliny (vi. 30), nor do I believe it to be true. Xerxês plundered the temple of much of its wealth and ornaments; but that he knocked down the vast building and the other Babylonian temples is incredible. Babylon always continued one of the chief cities of the Persian empire.

[1] What is stated in the text respecting Babylon is taken almost entirely from Herodotus: I have given briefly the most prominent points in his interesting narrative (i. 178—193), which well deserves to be read at length.

Herodotus is in fact our only original witness, speaking from his own observation and going into details, respecting the marvels of Babylon. Ktêsias, if his work had remained, would have been another original witness; but we have only a few extracts from him by Diodôrus. Strabo seems not to have visited Babylon, nor can it be affirmed that Kleitarchus did so. Arrian had Aristobulus to copy, and is valuable as far as he goes; but he does not enter into many particulars respecting the magnitude of the city or its appurtenances. Berosus also, if we possessed his book, would have been an eye-witness of the state of Babylon more than a century and a half later than Herodotus, but the few fragments remaining are hardly at all descriptive (see Berosi Fragm. p. 64—67, ed. Richter).

The magnitude of the works described by Herodotus naturally provokes suspicions of exaggeration. But there are good grounds for trusting him, in my judgment, on all points which fell under his own vision and means of verification—as distinguished from past facts, on which he could do no more than give what he heard. He had bestowed much attention on Assyria and its phænomena, as is evident from the fact that he had written (or prepared to write, if the suspicion be admissible that the work was never completed—Fabricius, Biblioth. Græc. ii. 20, 5) a special Assyrian history, which has not reached us (Ἀσσυριοίσι λόγοισι, i. 106—184). He is very precise in the measures of which he speaks: thus having described the dimensions of the walls in "royal cubits," he goes on immediately to tell us how much that measure differs from an ordinary cubit. He designedly suppresses a part of what he had heard respecting the produce of the Babylonian soil, from the mere apprehension of not being believed.

To these reasons for placing faith in Herodotus we may add another, not less deserving of attention. That which seems incredible in the constructions which he describes, arises simply from their enormous bulk, and the frightful quantity of human labour which must have been employed to execute them. He does not tell us, like Berosus (Fragm. p. 66), that these wonderful fortifications were completed in fifteen days—nor, like Quintus Curtius, that the length of one stadium was completed on each successive day of the year (v. 1, 26). To bring to pass all that Herodotus has described is a mere question of time, patience, number of labourers, and cost of maintaining them—for the materials were both close at hand and inexhaustible.

Now what would be the limit imposed upon the power and will of the old kings of Babylonia on these points? We can hardly assign that limit with so much confidence as to venture to pronounce a statement of Herodotus

Besides this great town of Babylon itself, there were throughout the neighbourhood, between the canals which united the Euphrates and the Tigris, many rich and populous villages, while Borsippa and other considerable towns were situated lower down on the

incredible, when he tells us something which he has seen, or verified from eye-witnesses. The pyramids and other works in Egypt are quite sufficient to make us mistrustful of our own means of appreciation; and the great wall of China (extending for 1200 English miles along what was once the whole northern frontier of the Chinese empire —from 20 to 25 feet high—wide enough for six horses to run abreast, and furnished with a suitable number of gates and bastions) *contains more material than all the buildings of the British empire put together*, according to Barrow's estimate (Transactions of the Royal Asiatic Society, vol. i. p. 7. *t. v.*; and Ideler, Ueber die Zeitrechnung der Chinesen, in the Abhandlungen of the Berlin Academy for 1837, ch. 3, p. 291).

Ktêsias gave the circuit of the walls of Babylon as 360 stadia; Kleitarchus, 365 stadia; Quintus Curtius, 368 stadia; and Strabo, 385 stadia; all different from Herodotus, who gives 480 stadia, a square of 120 stadia each side. Grosskurd (ad Strabon. xvi. p. 738), Letronne, and Heeren, all presume that the smaller number must be the truth, and that Herodotus must have been misinformed; and Grosskurd farther urges, that Herodotus cannot have *seen* the walls, inasmuch as he himself tells us that Darius caused them to be razed after the second siege and re-conquest (Herodot. iii. 159). But upon this we may observe— First, the expression (τὸ τεῖχος περιεῖλε) does not imply that the wall was so thoroughly and entirely razed by Darius as to leave no part standing,— still less that the great and broad moat was in all its circuit filled up and levelled. This would have been a most laborious operation in reference to such high and bulky masses, and withal not necessary for the purpose of rendering the town defenceless; for which purpose the destruction of certain portions of the wall is sufficient. Next, Herodotus speaks distinctly of the walls and ditch as existing in his time, when he saw the place; which does not exclude the possibility that numerous breaches may have been designedly made in them, or mere openings left in the walls without any actual gates, for the purpose of obviating all idea of revolt. But however this latter fact may be, certain it is that the great walls were either continuous, or discontinuous only to the extent of these designed breaches, when Herodotus saw them. He describes the town and its phænomena in the *present tense*: κέεται ἐν πεδίῳ μεγάλῳ, μέγαος ἐοῦσα μέπωπον ἕκαστον 120 σταδίων, ἐούσης τετραγώνου· οὗτοι στάδιοι τῆς περιόδου τῆς πόλιος γίνονται συνάπαντες 480. Τὸ μὲν νῦν μέγαθος τοσοῦτόν ἐστι τοῦ ἄστεος τοῦ Βαβυλωνίου. Ἐκεκόσμητο δὲ ὡς οὐδὲν ἄλλο πόλισμα τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν· ταφρὸς μὲν πρῶτά μιν βάθεά τε καὶ εὐρέα καὶ πλέη ὕδατος περιθέει· μετὰ δὲ, τεῖχος πεντήκοντα μὲν πηχέων βασιληίων ἐὸν τὸ εὖρος, ὕψος δὲ, διηκοσίων πηχέων. Ὁ δὲ βασιλήιος πηχυς τοῦ μετρίου ἐστὶ πήχεος μέζων τρισὶ δακτυλίοισι (i. 178). Again (c. 181)—Τοῦτο μὲν δὴ τὸ τεῖχος θώρηξ ἐστί· ἕτερον δὲ ἔσωθεν τεῖχος περιθεῖ, οὐ πολλῷ τέῳ ἀσθενέστερον τοῦ ἑτέρου τείχους, στεινότερον δέ. Then he describes the temple of Zeus Bêlus with its vast dimensions—καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ τοῦτο ἔτι ἐὸν, δύο σταδίων πάντη, ἐὸν τετράγωνον—in the language of one who had himself gone up to the top of it. After having mentioned the striking present phænomena of the temple, he specifies a statue of solid gold, twelve cubits high, which the Chaldæans told him had once been there, but which he did *not* see, and he carefully marks the distinction in his language—ἦν δὲ ἐν τῷ τεμένεϊ τούτῳ ἔτι τὸν χρόνον ἐκεῖνον καὶ ἀνδριὰς δυώδεκα πήχεων, χρύσεος, στέρεος. ἐγὼ μέν μιν οὐκ εἶδον· τὰ δὲ λέγεται ὑπὸ Χαλδαίων, ταῦτα λέγω (c. 183).

The argument therefore by which Grosskurd justifies the rejection of the statement of Herodotus is not to be reconciled with the language of the historian: Herodotus certainly saw both the walls and the ditch. Ktêsias saw them too, and his statement of the circuit, as 360 stadia, stands opposed to that of 480 stadia, which appears in Herodotus. But the authority of Herodotus is in my judgment so much

Euphrates itself. And the industry, agricultural as well as manufacturing, of the collective population was not less persevering than productive. Their linen, cotton, and woollen fabrics, and their richly ornamented carpets, were celebrated throughout all the Eastern regions. Their cotton was brought in part from islands in the Persian Gulf. The flocks of sheep tended by the Arabian Nomads supplied them with wool finer even than that of Milêtus or Tarentum. Besides the Chaldæan order of priests, there seem to have been among them certain other tribes with peculiar hereditary customs. Thus there were three tribes, probably near the mouth of the river, who restricted themselves to the eating of fish alone; but we have no evidences of a military caste (like that in Egypt) nor any other hereditary profession.

In order to present any conception of what Assyria was, in the early days of Grecian history and during the two centuries preceding the conquest of Babylon by Cyrus in 536 B.C., we unfortunately have no witness earlier than Herodotus, who did not see Babylon until near a century after that event—about seventy years after its still more disastrous revolt and second subjugation by Darius. Babylonia had become one of the twenty satrapies of the Persian empire, and besides paying a larger

superior to that of Ktêsias, that I accept the larger figure as more worthy of credit than the smaller. Sixty English miles (speaking in round numbers) of circuit is doubtless a wonder, but forty-five miles in circuit is a wonder also: granting means and will to execute the lesser of these two, the Babylonian kings can hardly be supposed inadequate to the greater.

To me the *height* of these artificial mountains, called *walls*, appears even more astonishing than their length or breadth. Yet it is curious that on this point the two eye-witnesses, Herodotus and Ktêsias, both agree, with only the difference between royal cubits and common cubits. Herodotus states the height at 200 royal cubits: Ktêsias, at fifty fathoms, which are equal to 200 common cubits (Diod. ii. 7)—τὸ δὲ ὕψος, ὡς μὲν Κτησίας φησί, πεντήκοντα ὀργυιῶν, ὡς δὲ ἔνιοι τῶν νεωτέρων ἔγραψαν, πηχῶν πεντηκοντα. Olearius (ad Philostratum Vit. Apollon. Tyan. i. 25) shows plausible reason for believing that the more recent writers (*νεώτεροι*) cut down the dimensions stated by Ktêsias simply because they thought such a vast height incredible. The difference between the royal cubit and the common cubit (as Herodotus on this occasion informs us) was three digits in favour of the former; his 200 royal cubits are thus equal to 337 feet 8 inches: Ktêsias has not attended to the difference between royal cubits and common cubits, and his estimate therefore is lower than that of Herodotus by 37 feet 8 inches.

On the whole, I cannot think that we are justified, either by the authority of such counter-testimony as can be produced, or by the intrinsic wonder of the case, in rejecting the dimensions of the walls of Babylon as given by Herodotus.

Quintus Curtius states that a large proportion of the enclosed space was not occupied by dwellings, but sown and planted (v. 1, 26: compare Diodôr. ii. 7).

regular tribute than any of the other nineteen, supplied, from its exuberant soil, provision for the Great King and his countless host of attendants during one-third part of the year.[1] Yet it was then in a state of comparative degradation, having had its immense walls breached by Darius, and having afterwards undergone the ill-usage of Xerxês; who, since he stripped its temples, and especially the venerated temple of Bêlus, of some of their richest ornaments, would probably be still more reckless in his mode of dealing with the civic edifices.[2] If in spite of such inflictions, and in spite of that manifest evidence of poverty and suffering in the people which Herodotus expressly notices, it continued to be what he describes, still counted as almost the chief city of the Persian empire, both in the time of the younger Cyrus and in that of Alexander[3]—we may judge what it must once have been, without either foreign satrap or foreign tribute,[4] under its Assyrian kings and Chaldæan priests, during the last of the two centuries which intervened between the æra of Nabonassar and the capture of the city by Cyrus the Great. Though several of the kings, during the first of these two centuries, had contributed much to the great works of Babylon, yet it was during the second century of the two, after the capture of Nineveh by the Medes, and under Nebuchadnezzar and Nitôkris, that the kings attained the maximum of their power and the city its greatest enlargement. It was Nebuchadnezzar who constructed the seaport Terêdon, at the mouth of the Euphrates, and who probably excavated the long ship canal of near 400 miles which joined it. That canal was perhaps formed partly from a natural western branch of the Euphrates.[5] The

Babylon—only known during the time of its degradation—yet even then the first city in Western Asia.

[1] Herodot. i. 196.

[2] Arrian, Exp. Al. iii. 16, 6; vii. 17, 3; Quint. Curtius, iii. 3, 16.

[3] Xenoph. Anab. i. 4, 11; Arrian, Exp. Al. iii. 16, 3. καὶ ἅμα τοῦ πολέμου τὸ ἆθλον ἡ Βαβυλὼν καὶ τὰ Σούσα ἐφαίνετο.

[4] See the statement of the large receipts of the satrap Tritantæchmês, and his immense establishment of horses and Indian dogs (Herodot. i. 192).

[5] There is a valuable examination of the lower course of the Euphrates, with the changes which it has undergone, in Ritter, West-Asien, b. iii. Abtheil iii. Abschnitt i. sect. 29, p. 45—49, and the passage from Abydenus in the latter page.

For the distance between Terêdon or Diridôtis, at the mouth of the Euphrates (which remained separate from that of the Tigris until the first century of the Christian æra), to Babylon, see Strabo, ii. p. 80; xvi. p. 739.

It is important to keep in mind the warning given by Ritter, that none of the maps of the course of the river Euphrates, prepared previously to the publication of Colonel Chesney's ex-

brother of the poet Alkæus—Antimenidas, who served in the Babylonian army, and distinguished himself by his personal valour (600—580 B.C.)—would have seen it in its full glory.[1] He is the earliest Greek of whom we hear individually in connexion with the Babylonians. It marks[2] strikingly the contrast between the Persian kings and the Babylonian kings, on whose ruin they rose—that while the latter incurred immense expense to facilitate the communication between Babylon and the sea, the former artificially impeded the lower course of the Tigris, in order that their residence at Susa might be out of the reach of assailants.

Immense command of human labour possessed by the Babylonian kings.

That which strikes us most, and which must have struck the first Grecian visitors much more, both in Assyria and Egypt, is the unbounded command of naked human strength possessed by these early kings, and the effect of mere mass and indefatigable perseverance, unaided either by theory or by artifice, in the accomplishment of gigantic results.[3] In Assyria the results were in great part exaggerations of enterprises in themselves useful to the people for irrigation and defence: religious worship was ministered to in the like manner, as well as the personal fancies and pomp of their kings: while in Egypt the latter class predominates more over the former. We scarcely trace in either of them the higher sentiment of art, which owes its first marked development to Grecian susceptibility and genius. But the human mind is in every stage of its progress, and most of all in its rude and unreflecting period, strongly impressed by visible and tangible magnitude, and awe-struck by the evidences of great power. To this feeling, for what exceeded the demands of practical convenience and security, the wonders both in Egypt

pedition in 1836, are to be trusted. That expedition gave the first complete and accurate survey of the course of the river, and led to the detection of many mistakes previously committed by Mannert, Reichard, and other able geographers and chartographers. To the immense mass of information contained in Ritter's comprehensive and laborious work, is to be added the farther merit, that he is always careful in pointing out where the geographical data are insufficient and fall short of certainty. See West-Asien, B. iii. Abtheilung iii. Abschnitt 1. sect. 41, p. 959.

1 Strabo, xiii. p. 617, with the mutilated fragment of Alkæus, which O. Müller has so ingeniously corrected (Rheinisch. Museum, i. 4, p. 287).

2 Strabo, xvi. p. 740.

3 Diodôr. (i. 31) states this point justly with regard to the ancient kings of Egypt—ἔργα μεγάλα καὶ θαυμαστὰ διὰ τὰς πολυχειρίας κατασκευάσαντας, ἀθάνατα τῆς ἑαυτῶν δόξης καταλιπεῖν ὑπομνήματα.

and Assyria chiefly appealed. The execution of such colossal works demonstrates habits of regular industry, a concentrated population under one government, and, above all, an implicit submission to the regal and priestly sway—contrasting forcibly with the small autonomous communities of Greece and Western Europe, wherein the will of the individual citizen was so much more energetic and uncontrolled. The acquisition of habits of regular industry, so foreign to the natural temper of man, was brought about in Egypt and Assyria, in China and Hindostan, before it had acquired any footing in Europe; but it was purchased either by prostrate obedience to a despotic rule, or by imprisonment within the chain of a consecrated institution of caste. Even during the Homeric period of Greece, these countries had attained a certain civilization in mass, without the acquisition of any high mental qualities or the development of any individual genius. The religious and political sanction, sometimes combined and sometimes separate, determined for every one his mode of life, his creed, his duties, and his place in society, without leaving any scope for the will or reason of the agent himself. Now the Phœnicians and Carthaginians manifest a degree of individual impulse and energy which puts them greatly above this type of civilization, though in their tastes, social feelings, and religion they are still Asiatic. And even the Babylonian community—though their Chaldæan priests are the parallel of the Egyptian priests, with a less measure of ascendency—combine with their industrial aptitude and constancy of purpose something of that strenuous ferocity of character which marks so many people of the Semitic race—Jews, Phœnicians, and Carthaginians. These Semitic people stand distinguished as well from the Egyptian life—enslaved by childish caprices and antipathies, and by endless frivolities of ceremonial detail—as from the flexible, many-sided, and self-organising Greek; the latter not only capable of opening both for himself and for the human race the highest walks of intellect and the full creative agency of art, but also gentler by far in his private sympathies and dealings than his contemporaries on the Euphrates, the Jordan, or the Nile—for we are not of course to

Collective civilization in Asia, without individual freedom or development.

Graduated contrast between Egyptians, Assyrians, Phœnicians, and Greeks.

compare him with the exigencies of Western Europe in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

Deserts and predatory tribes surrounding the Babylonians.

Both in Babylonia and in Egypt, the vast monuments, embankments, and canals, executed by collective industry, appeared the more remarkable to an ancient traveller by contrast with the desert regions and predatory tribes immediately surrounding them. West of the Euphrates, the sands of Arabia extended northward, with little interruption, to the latitude of the Gulf of Issus; they even covered the greater part of Mesopotamia,[1] or the country between the Euphrates and the Tigris, beginning a short distance northward of the wall called the wall of Media above-mentioned, which (extending in a direction nearly southward from the Tigris to the Euphrates) had been erected to protect Babylonia against the incursions of the Medes.[2] Eastward of the Tigris again, along the range of Mount Zagros, but at no great distance from the river, were found the Elymæi, Kossæi, Uxii, Parætakeni, &c. —tribes which (to use the expression of Strabo),[3] "as inhabiting a poor country, were under the necessity of living by the plunder of their neighbours". Such rude bands of depredators on the one side, and such wide tracts of sand on the two others, without vegetation or water, contrasted powerfully with the industry and productiveness of Babylonia. Babylon itself is to be considered not as one continuous city, but as a city together with its surrounding district enclosed within immense walls, the height and thickness of which were in themselves a sufficient defence, so that the place was assailable only at its gates. In case of need it would serve as shelter for the persons and property of the village-inhabitants in Babylonia. We shall see hereafter how

[1] See the description of this desert in Xenophôn, Anab. i. 5, 1—8.

[2] The Ten Thousand Greeks passed from the outside to the inside of the wall of Media: it was 100 feet high, 20 feet wide, and was reported to them as extending 20 parasangs or 600 stadia (= 70 miles) in length (Xenoph. Anab. ii. 4, 12). Eratosthenês called it τὸ Σεμιράμιδος διατείχισμα (Strabo, ii. p. 80).

There is some confusion about the wall of Media: Mannert (Geogr. der G. und R. v. 2, p. 280) and Forbiger also (Alte Geogr. sect. 97, p. 616, note 94) appear to have confounded the ditch dug by special order of Artaxerxês to oppose the march of the younger Cyrus with the Nahar-Malcha or Royal Canal between the Tigris and the Euphrates: see Xenoph. Anab. i. 7, 15.

It is singular that Herodotus makes no mention of the wall of Media, though his subject (i. 185) naturally conducts him to it. The little information which can be found about it will be seen put together in Ch. 70; where I recount the Expedition of Cyrus.

[3] Strabo, xvi. p. 744

useful under trying circumstances such a resource was, when we come to review the invasions of Attica by the Peloponnesians, and the mischiefs occasioned by a temporary crowd pouring in from the country, so as to overcharge the intramural accommodations of Athens. Spacious as Babylon was, however, it is affirmed by Strabo that Ninus or Nineveh was considerably larger.

# APPENDIX.

Since the first edition of these volumes, the interesting work of Mr. Layard, "Nineveh and its Remains," together with his illustrative Drawings, "The Monuments of Nineveh," have been published. And through his unremitting valuable exertions in surmounting all the difficulties connected with excavations on the spot, the British Museum has been enriched with a valuable collection of real Assyrian sculptures and other monuments. A number of similar relics of Assyrian antiquity, obtained by M. Botta and others, have also been deposited in the museum of the Louvre at Paris.

In respect to Assyrian art, indeed to the history of art in general, a new world has thus been opened, which promises to be fruitful of instruction; especially when we consider that the ground out of which the recent acquisitions have been obtained, has yet been most imperfectly examined, and may be expected to yield an ampler harvest hereafter, assuming circumstances tolerably favourable to investigation. The sculptures to which we are now introduced, with all their remarkable peculiarities of style and idea, must undoubtedly date from the eighth or seventh century B.C. at the latest—and may be much earlier. The style which they display forms a parallel and subject of comparison, though in many points extremely different, to that of early Egypt—at a time when the ideal combinations of the Greeks were, as far as we know, embodied only in epic and lyric poetry.

But in respect to early Assyrian history, we have yet to find out whether much new information can be safely deduced from these interesting monuments. The cuneiform inscriptions now brought to light are indeed very numerous: and if they can be deciphered, on rational and trustworthy principles, we can hardly fail to acquire more or less of positive knowledge respecting a period now plunged in total darkness. But from the monuments of art alone, it would be unsafe to draw historical inferences. For example, when we find sculptures representing a king taking a city by assault, or receiving captives brought to him, &c., we are not to conclude that this commemorates any real and positive conquest recently made by the Assyrians. Our know-

ledge of the subjects of Greek sculpture on temples is quite sufficient to make us disallow any such inference, unless there be some corroborative proof. Some means must first be discovered of discriminating historical from mythical subjects: a distinction which I here notice, the rather because Mr. Layard shows occasional tendency to overlook it in his interesting remarks and explanations: see especially vol. ii. ch. vi. p. 409.

From the rich and abundant discoveries made at Nimroud, combined with those at Kouyunjik and Khorsabad, Mr. Layard is inclined to comprehend all these three within the circuit of ancient Nineveh; admitting for that circuit the prodigious space alleged by Diodôrus out of Ktêsias, 480 stadia or above fifty English miles. (See Nineveh and its Remains, vol. ii. ch. ii. p. 242—253.) Mr. Layard considers that the north-west portion of Nimroud exhibits monuments more ancient, and at the same time better in style and execution, than the south-west portion,—or than Kouyunjik and Khorsabad (vol. ii. ch. i. p. 204; ch. iii. p. 305). If this hypothesis, as to the ground covered by Nineveh, be correct, probably future excavations will confirm it—or, if incorrect, refute it. But I do not at all reject the supposition on the simple ground of excessive magnitude: on the contrary, I should at once believe the statement, if it were reported by Herodotus after a visit to the spot, like the magnitude of Babylon. The testimony of Ktêsias is indeed very inferior in value to that of Herodotus: yet it ought hardly to be outweighed by the supposed improbability of so great a walled space, when we consider how little we know where to set bounds to the power of the Assyrian kings in respect to command of human labour for any process merely simple and toilsome, with materials both near and inexhaustible. Not to mention the great wall of China, we have only to look at the Picts' Wall, and other walls built by the Romans in Britain, to satisfy ourselves that a great length of fortification, under circumstances much less favourable than the position of the ancient Assyrian kings, is noway incredible in itself. Though the walls of Nineveh and Babylon were much *larger* than those of Paris as it now stands, yet when we compare the two not merely in size, but in respect of costliness, elaboration, and contrivance, the latter will be found to represent an infinitely greater *amount of work.*

Larissa and Mespila, those deserted towns and walls which Xenophôn saw in the retreat of the Ten Thousand (Anabas. iii. 4, 6—10), coincide in point of distance and situation with Nimroud and Kouyunjik, according to Mr. Layard's remark. And his supposition seems not improbable, that both of them were formed by the Medes out of the ruins of the conquered city of Nineveh. Neither of them singly

seems at all adequate to the reputation of that ancient city, or walled circuit. According to the account of Herodotus, Phraortês the second Median king had attacked Nineveh, but had been himself slain in the attempt, and lost nearly all his army. It was partly to revenge this disgrace that Kyaxarês son of Phraortês assailed Nineveh (Herod. i. 102—103): we may thus see a special reason, in addition to his own violence of temper (i. 73), why he destroyed the city after having taken it (Νίνου ἀναστάτου γενομένης, i. 178). It is easy to conceive that this vast walled space may have been broken up and converted into two Median towns, both on the Tigris. In the subsequent change from Median to Persian dominion, these towns also became depopulated, as far as the strange tales which Xenophôn heard in his retreat can be trusted. The interposition of these two Median towns doubtless contributed, for the time, to put out of sight the traditions respecting the old Ninus which had before stood upon their site. But such traditions never became extinct, and a new town bearing the old name of Ninus must have subsequently arisen on the spot. This second Ninus is recognised by Tacitus, Ptolemy, and Ammianus, not only as existing, but as pretending to uninterrupted continuity of succession from the ancient "caput Assyriæ".

Mr. Layard remarks on the facility with which edifices, such as those in Assyria, built of sunburnt bricks, perish when neglected, and crumble away into earth, leaving little or no trace.

# CHAPTER XX.

## EGYPTIANS.

IF, on one side, the Phœnicians were separated from the productive Babylonia by the Arabian Desert, on the other side, the western portion of the same desert divided them from the no less productive valley of the Nile. In those early times which preceded the rise of Greek civilization, their land trade embraced both regions, and they served as the sole agents of international traffic between the two. Conveniently as their towns were situated for maritime commerce with the Nile, Egyptian jealousy had excluded Phœnician vessels not less than those of the Greeks from the mouths of that river, until the reign of Psammetichus (672—618 B.C.); and thus even the merchants of Tyre could then reach Memphis only by means of caravans, employing as their instruments (as I have already observed) the Arabian tribes,[1] alternately plunderers and carriers.

Phœnicians —the link of commerce between Egypt and Assyria.

Respecting Egypt, as respecting Assyria, since the works of Hekatæus are unfortunately lost, our earliest information is derived from Herodotus, who visited Egypt about two centuries after the reign of Psammetichus, when it formed part of one of the twenty Persian satrapies. The Egyptian marvels and peculiarities which he recounts are more numerous as well as more diversified than the Assyrian; and had the vestiges been effaced as completely

Herodotus —earliest Grecian informant about Egypt.

[1] Strabo, xvi. p. 766, 776, 778; Pliny, H. N. 32. "Arabes, mirum dictu, ex innumeris populis pars æqua in commerciis aut latrociniis degunt: in universum gentes ditissimæ, ut apud quas maximæ opes Romanorum Parthorumque subsistant—vendentibus quæ a mari aut sylvis capiunt, nihil invicem redimentibus."

The latter part of this passage of Pliny presents an enunciation sufficiently distinct, though by implication only, of what has been called the *mercantile theory* in political economy.

in the former as in the latter, his narrative would probably have met with an equal degree of suspicion. But the hard stone, combined with the dry climate of Upper Egypt (where a shower of rain counted as a prodigy), have given such permanence to the monuments in the valley of the Nile, that enough has remained to bear out the father of Grecian history, and to show that, in describing what he professes to have seen, he is a guide perfectly trustworthy. For that which he heard, he appears only in the character of a reporter, and often an incredulous reporter. Yet though this distinction between his hearsay and his ocular evidence is not only obvious, but of the most capital moment,[1] it has been too often neglected by those who depreciate him as a witness.

The Nile in the time of Herodotus.

The mysterious river Nile, a god[2] in the eyes of ancient Egyptians, and still preserving both its volume and its usefulness undiminished amidst the general degradation of the country, reached the sea in the time of Herodotus by five natural mouths, besides two others artificially dug. Its Pelusiac branch formed the eastern boundary of Egypt, its Kanôpic branch (170 miles distant) the western; while the Sebennytic branch was a continuation of the straight line of the upper river: from this latter branched off the Saitic and the Mendesian arms.[3] The overflowings of the Nile are far more

[1] To give one example:—Herodotus mentions an opinion given to him by the γραμματιστής (comptroller) of the property of Athênê at Sais, to the effect that the sources of the Nile were at an immeasurable depth in the interior of the earth, between Syênê and Elephantinê, and that Psammetichus had vainly tried to sound them with a rope many thousand fathoms in length (ii. 28). In mentioning this tale (perfectly deserving of being *recounted* at least, because it came from a person of considerable station in the country), Herodotus expressly says,—"this comptroller seemed to me to be only bantering, though he professed to know accurately"—οὗτος δὲ ἐμοίγε παίζειν ἐδόκεε, φάμενος εἰδέναι ἀτρεκέως. Now Strabo (xvii. p. 819), in alluding to this story, introduces it just as if Herodotus had told it for a fact—Πολλὰ δ' Ἡρόδοτός τε καὶ ἄλλοι φλυαροῦσιν, οἷον, &c.

Many other instances might be cited, both from ancient and modern writers, of similar carelessness or injustice towards this admirable author.

[2] Οἱ ἱρέες τοῦ Νείλου, Herod. ii. 90. The water of the Nile is found, on chemical analysis, to be of remarkable purity. It was supposed also by the Egyptian priests to have a fattening property. In their eyes, all fat, flesh, or superfluous excrescence (such as hair or nails) on the body, was impure. Accordingly the bull Apis was not allowed to drink out of the Nile, lest he should become fat; but had a well especially sunk for him (Plutarch, De Isid. et Osir. c. 5, p. 353, with the note of Parthey, in his recent edition of that treatise, p. 161).

[3] The seven mouths of the Nile, so notorious in antiquity, are not conformable to the modern geography of the country: see Mannert, Geogr. der Gr. und Röm. x. 1, p. 539.

The breadth of the base of the Delta, between Pelusium and Kanôpus, is

fertilising than those of the Euphrates in Assyria,—partly from their more uniform recurrence both in time and quantity, partly from the rich silt which they bring down and deposit, whereas the Euphrates served only as moisture. The patience of the Egyptians had excavated, in Middle Egypt, the vast reservoir (partly, it seems, natural and pre-existing) called the Lake of Mœris—and in the Delta, a net-work of numerous canals. Yet on the whole the hand of man had been less tasked than in Babylonia: whilst the soil, annually enriched, yielded its abundant produce without either plough or spade to assist the seed cast in by the husbandman.[1] That under these circumstances a dense and regularly organised population should have been concentrated in fixed abodes along the valley occupied by this remarkable river is no matter of wonder. The marked peculiarities of the locality seem to have brought about such a result, in the earliest periods to which human society can be traced.

overstated by Herodotus (ii. 6—9) at 3600 stadia; Diodorus (i. 34) and Strabo give 1300 stadia, which is near the truth, though the text of Strabo in various passages is not uniform on this matter, and requires correction. See Grosskurd's note on Strabo, ii. p. 64 (note 3, p. 101), and xvii. p. 186 (note 9, p. 332). Pliny gives the distance at 170 miles (H. N. v. 9).

[1] Herod. i. 193. Παραγίνεται ὁ σῖτος (in Babylonia) οὐ, κατάπερ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, αὐτοῦ τοῦ ποτάμου ἀναβαίνοντος ἐς τὰς ἀρούρας, ἀλλὰ χερσί τε καὶ κηλωνηΐοισι ἀρδόμενος· ἡ γὰρ Βαβυλωνίη χώρη πᾶσα, κατάπερ ἡ Αἰγυπτίη, κατατέτμηται ἐς διώρυχας, &c.

Herodotus was informed that the canals in Egypt had been dug by the labour of that host of prisoners whom the victorious Sesostris brought home from his conquests (ii. 108). The canals in Egypt served the purpose partly of communication between the different cities, partly of a constant supply of water to those towns which were not immediately on the Nile: "that vast river, so constantly at work" (to use the language of Herodotus—ὑπὸ τοσούτου τε ποτάμου καὶ οὕτως ἐργατικοῦ, ii. 11) spared the Egyptians all the toil of irrigation which the Assyrian cultivator underwent (ii. 14).

Lower Egypt, as Herodotus saw it, though a continued flat, was unfit either for horse or car, from the number of intersecting canals—ἄνιππος καὶ ἀναμάξευτος (ii. 108). But Lower Egypt, as Volney saw it, was among the countries in the world best suited to the action of cavalry, so that he pronounces the native population of the country to have no chance of contending against the Mamelukes (Volney, Travels in Egypt and Syria, vol. i. ch. 12, sect. 2, p. 199). The country has reverted to the state in which it was (ἱππασίμη καὶ ἀναξευομένη πᾶσα) before the canals were made—one of the many striking illustrations of the difference between the Egypt which a modern traveller visits, and that which Herodotus and even Strabo saw—ὅλην πλωτὴν διωρύγων ἐπὶ διώρυξι τμηθεισῶν (Strabo, xvii. p. 788).

Considering the early age of Herodotus, his remarks on the geological character of Egypt as a deposit of the accumulated mud by the Nile, appear to me most remarkable (ii. 8—14). Having no fixed number of years included in his religious belief as measuring the past existence of the earth, he carries his mind back without difficulty to what may have been effected by this river in 10,000 or 20,000 years, or "in the whole space of time elapsed before I was born" (ii. 11). So also, Anaxagoras (Fragm. p. 179, Schaub.) entertained just views about the cause of the rising of the Nile, though Herodotus did not share his views.

About the lake of Mœris, see a note a little farther on.

Along the 550 miles of its undivided course from Syênê to Memphis, where for the most part the mountains leave only a comparatively narrow strip on each bank—as well as in the broad expanse between Memphis and the Mediterranean—there prevailed a peculiar form of theocratic civilization, from a date which even in the time of Herodotus was immemorially ancient. But if we seek for some measure of this antiquity, earlier than the time when Greeks were first admitted into Egypt in the reign of Psammetichus, we find only the computations of the priests, reaching back for many thousand years, first of government by immediate and present gods, next of human kings. Such computations have been transmitted to us by Herodotus, Manetho, and Diodôrus[1]—agreeing in their essential conception of the foretime, with gods in the first part of the series and men in the second, but differing materially in events, names, and epochs. Probably, if we possessed lists from other Egyptian temples, besides those which Manetho drew up at Heliopolis or which Herodotus learned at Memphis, we should find discrepancies from both these two. To compare these lists, and to reconcile them as far as they admit of being reconciled, is interesting as enabling us to understand the Egyptian mind, but conducts to no trustworthy chronological results, and forms no part of the task of an historian of Greece.

To the Greeks Egypt was a closed world before the reign of Psammetichus, though after that time it gradually became an important part of their field both of observation and action. The astonishment which the country created in the mind of the earliest Grecian visitors may be learnt even from the narrative of Herodotus, who doubtless knew it by report long before he went there. Both the physical and moral features of Egypt stood in strong contrast with Grecian experience. "Not only (says Herodotus) does the climate differ from all other climates, and the river from all other rivers, but Egyptian laws and customs are opposed on almost all points to those of other men."[2] The Delta was at that time full of large and populous cities,[3] built on

[1] See note in Appendix to this chapter.

[2] Herodot. ii. 35. Αἰγύπτιοι ἅμα τῷ οὐρανῷ τῷ κατὰ σφέας ἐόντι ἑτεροίῳ, καὶ τῷ ποτάμῳ φύσιν ἀλλοίην παρεχομένῳ ἢ οἱ ἄλλοι πόταμοι, τὰ πολλὰ πάντα ἐμπαλιν τοῖσι ἄλλοισι ἀνθρώποισι ἐστήσαντο ἤθεά τε καὶ νόμους.

[3] Theokritus (Idyll. xvii. 83) celebrates Ptolemy Philadelphus king of

artificial elevations of ground and seemingly not much inferior to Memphis itself, which was situated on the left bank of the Nile (opposite to the site of the modern Cairo), a little higher up that the spot where the Delta begins. From the time when the Greeks first became cognizant of Egypt, to the building of Alexandria and the reign of the Ptolemies, Memphis was the first city in Egypt. Yet it seems not to have been always so; there had been an earlier period when Thêbes was the seat of Egyptian power, and Upper Egypt of far more consequence than Middle Egypt. Vicinity to the Delta, which must always have contained the largest number of cities and the widest surface of productive territory, probably enabled Memphis to usurp this honour from Thêbes; and the predominance of Lower Egypt was still farther confirmed when Psammetichus introduced Ionian and Karian troops as his auxiliaries in the government of the country. But the stupendous magnitude of the temples and palaces, the profusion of ornamental sculpture and painting, the immeasurable range of sepulchres hewn in the rocks still remaining as attestations of the grandeur of Thêbes—not to mention Ombi, Edfu, and Elephantinê—show that Upper Egypt was once the place to which the land-tax from the productive Delta was paid, and where the kings and priests who employed it resided. It has been even contended that Thêbes itself was originally settled by immigrants from still higher regions of the river; and the remains, yet found along the Nile in Nubia, are analogous, both in style and in grandeur, to those in the Thebais.[1] What is remarkable is, that both the one

Thêbes and Upper Egypt—of more importance in early times than Lower Egypt, but not so in the days of Herodotus.

Egypt as ruling over 33,336 cities: the manner in which he strings these figures into three hexameter verses is somewhat ingenious. The priests, in describing to Herodotus the unrivalled prosperity which they affirmed Egypt to have enjoyed under Amasis, the last king before the Persian conquest, said that there were then 20,000 cities in the country (ii. 177). Diodôrus tells us that 18,000 different cities and considerable villages were registered in the Egyptian ἀναγραφαί (i. 31) for the ancient times, but that 30,000 were numbered under the Ptolemies.

[1] Respecting the monuments of ancient Egpytian art, see the summary of O. Müller, Archäologie der Kunst, sect. 215—233, and a still better account and appreciation of them in Carl Schnaase, Geschichte der Bildenden Künst bey den Alten, Düsseldorf, 1843, vol. i. book ii. ch. 1 and 2.

In regard to the credibility and value of Egyptian history anterior to Psammetichus, there are many excellent remarks by Mr. Kenrick, in the preface to his work, "The Egypt of Herodotus" (the second book of Herodotus, with notes). About the recent discoveries derived from the hieroglyphics, he says, "We know that it

and the other are strikingly distinguished from the Pyramids, which alone remain to illustrate the site of the ancient Memphis. There are no pyramids either in Upper Egypt or in Nubia; but on the Nile above Nubia, near the Ethiopian Meroê, pyramids in great number, though of inferior dimensions, are again found.

From whence, or in what manner, Egyptian institutions first took their rise, we have no means of determining. Yet there seems little to bear out the supposition of Heeren[1] and other eminent authors, that they were transmitted down the Nile by Ethiopian colonists from Meroê. Herodotus certainly conceived Egyptians and Ethiopians (who in his time jointly occupied the border island of Elephantinê, which he had himself visited) as completely distinct from each other, in race and customs not less than in language; the latter being generally of the rudest habits, of great stature, and still greater physical strength—the chief part of them subsisting on meat and milk, and blest with unusual longevity. He knew of Meroê as the Ethiopian metropolis and a considerable city, fifty-two days' journey higher up the river than Elephantinê. But his informants had given him no idea of analogy between its institutions and those of Egypt.[2] He states

was the custom of the Egyptian kings to inscribe the temples and obelisks which they raised with their own names or with distinguishing hieroglyphics; but in no one instance do these names as read by the modern decipherers of hieroglyphics on monuments said to have been raised by kings before Psammetichus, correspond with the names given by Herodotus". (Preface, p. xliv.) He farther adds in a note, "A name which has been read phonetically *Mena*, has been found at Thêbes, and Mr. Wilkinson supposes it to be Menes. It is remarkable, however, that the names which follow are not phonetically written, so that it is probable that this is not to be read *Mena*. Besides, the cartouche, which immediately follows, is that of a king of the eighteenth dynasty; so that, at all events, it cannot have been engraved till many centuries after the supposed age of Menes; and the occurrence of the name no more decides the question of historical existence than that of Cecrops in the Parian Chronicle."

[1] Heeren, Ideen über den Verkehr der Alten Welt, part ii 1, p. 403. The opinion given by Parthey, however (De Philis Insulâ, p. 100, Berlin, 1830), may perhaps be just: "Antiquissimâ ætate eundem populum, dicamus Ægyptiacum, Nili ripas inde a Meroë insulâ usque ad Ægyptum inferiorem occupasse, e monumentorum congruentiâ apparet: posteriore tempore, tabulis et annalibus nostris longe superiore, alia stirps Æthiopica interiora terræ usque ad cataractam Syenensem obtinuit. Ex quâ ætate certa rerum notitia ad nos pervenit Ægyptiorum et Æthiopum segregatio jam facta est. Herodotus cæterique scriptores Græci populos acute discernunt."

At this moment, Syênê and its cataract mark the boundary of two people and two languages—Egyptians and Arabic language to the north, Nubians and Berber language to the south (Parthey, *ibid.*).

[2] Compare Herodot. ii. 30—32; iii. 19—25: Strabo, xvi. p. 818. Herodotus gives the description of their armour and appearance as part of the army of Xerxês (vii. 69); they painted their bodies: compare Plin. H. N. xxxiii. 36. How little Ethiopia was visited in his time, may be gathered from the tenor of his statements: according to Dio-

that the migration of a large number of the Egyptian military caste, during the reign of Psammetichus, into Ethiopia, had first communicated civilised customs to these southern barbarians. If there be really any connexion between the social phænomena of Egypt and those of Meroê, it seems more reasonable to treat the latter as derivative from the former.[1]

Egyptian castes or hereditary professions.

The population of Egypt was classified into certain castes or hereditary professions, of which the number was not exactly defined, and is represented differently by authors. The priests stand clearly marked out, as the order richest, most powerful, and most venerated. Distributed all over the country, they possessed exclusively the means of reading and writing,[2] besides a vast amount of narrative matter treasured up in the memory, the whole stock of medical and physical knowledge then attainable, and those rudiments of geometry (or rather land-measuring) which were so often called into use in a country annually inundated. To each god, and to each temple, throughout Egypt, lands and other properties belonged, whereby the numerous bands of priests attached to him were maintained. It seems too that a farther portion of the lands of the kingdom was set apart for them in individual property, though on this point no certainty is attainable. Their ascendency, both direct and indirect, over the minds of the people, was immense. They prescribed that minute ritual under which the life of every Egyptian, not excepting the king himself,[3] was passed, and which was for themselves more full of

Priests.

dôrus (i. 37), no Greeks visited it earlier than the expedition of Ptolemy Philadelphus—οὕτως ἄξενα ἦν τὰ περὶ τοὺς τόπους τούτους, καὶ παντελῶς ἐπικίνδυνα. Diodôrus, however, is incorrect in saying that no Greek had ever gone as far southward as the frontier of Egypt: Herodotus certainly visited Elephantinê, probably other Greeks also.

The statements respecting the theocratical state of Meroê and its superior civilization come from Diodôrus (iii. 2, 5, 7), Strabo (xvii. p. 822), and Pliny (H. N. vi. 29—33), much later than Herodotus. Diodôrus seems to have had no older informants before him (about Ethiopia) than Agatharchidês and Artemidôrus, both in the second century B.C. (Diod. iii. 10).

[1] Wesseling ad Diodôr. iii. 3.

[2] Herodot. ii. 37. Θεοσεβέες δὲ περισσῶς ἐόντες μάλιστα πάντων ἀνθρώπων, &c. He is astonished at the retentiveness of their memory; some of them had more stories to tell than any one whom he had ever seen (ii. 77—109; Diodôr. i. 73).

The word *priest* conveys to a modern reader an idea very different from that of the Egyptian ἱερεῖς, who were not a profession, but an order, comprising many occupations and professions—Josephus the Jew was in like manner an ἱερεὺς κατὰ γένος (cont. Apion c. 3). So also the Brahmins in British India are an order.

[3] Diodôrus (i. 70—73) gives an elaborate description of the monastic strictness with which the daily duties of the

harassing particularities than for any one else. Every day in the year belonged to some particular god; the priests alone knew to which. There were different gods in every Nome, though Isis and Osiris were common to all. The priests of each god constituted a society apart, more or less important, according to the comparative celebrity of the temple. The high priests of Hephæstos, whose dignity was said to have been transmitted from father to son through a series of 341 generations[2] (commemorated by the like number of colossal statues, which Herodotus himself saw), were second in importance only to the king. The property of each temple included troops of dependents and slaves, who were stamped with "holy marks,"[3] and who must have been numerous in order to suffice for the large buildings and their constant visitors.

The military order.

Next in importance to the sacerdotal caste were the military caste or order, whose native name[4] indicated that they stood on the left-hand of the king, while the priests occupied the right. They were classified into Kalasiries and Hermotybii, who occupied lands in eighteen particular Nomes or provinces principally in Lower Egypt. The Kalasiries had once amounted to 160,000 men, the Hermotybii to 250,000, when at the maximum of their population; but that highest point had long been past in the time of Herodotus. To each man of this soldier-caste was assigned a portion of land equal to about 6½ English acres, free from any tax; but what measures were taken to keep the lots of land in suitable harmony with a fluctuating number of holders, we know not. The statement of Herodotus relates to a time long past and gone, and describes what was believed, by the priests with whom he talked, to have been the primitive constitution of their country anterior to the Persian conquest. The like is still more true respecting the statement

Egyptian king were measured out by the priests: compare Plutarch, De Isid. et Osirid. p. 353, who refers to Hekatæus (probably Hekatæus of Abdêra) and Eudoxus. The priests represented that Psammetichus was the first Egyptian king who broke through the priestly canon limiting the royal allowance of wine: compare Strabo, xvii. p. 790.

The Ethiopian kings at Meroê are said to have been kept in the like pupilage by the priestly order, until a king named Ergamenês, during the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus in Egypt, emancipated himself and put the chief priest to death (Diodôr. iii. 6).

[1] *Herodot. ii. 82, 83.*

[2] Herodot. ii. 143.

[3] Herodot. ii. 113. στίγματα ἱρά.

[4] Herodot. ii. 30.

of Diodôrus,[1] who says that the territory of Egypt was divided into three parts—one part belonging to the king, another to the priests, and the remainder to the soldiers.[2] His language seems to intimate that every Nome was so divided, and even that the three portions were equal, though he does not expressly say so. The result of these statements, combined with the history of Joseph in the book of Genesis, seems to be, that the lands of the priests and the soldiers were regarded as privileged property and exempt from all burthens, while the remaining soil was considered as the property of the king, who however received from it a fixed proportion, one-fifth of the total produce, leaving the rest in the hands of the cultivators.[3] We are told that Sethôs, priest of the god Phtha (or Hephæstos) at Memphis and afterwards named King, oppressed the military caste and deprived them of their lands. In revenge for this they withheld from him their aid when Egypt was invaded by Sennacherib. Farther, in the reign of Psammetichus, a large number (240,000) of these soldiers migrated into Ethiopia from a feeling of discontent, leaving their wives and children behind them.[4] It was Psammetichus who first introduced Ionian and Karian mercenaries into the country, and began innovations on the ancient Egyptian constitution: so that the disaffection towards him, on the part of the native soldiers, no longer permitted to serve as exclusive guards to the king, is not difficult to explain. The Kalasiries and Hermotybii were interdicted from every description of art or trade. There can be little doubt that under the Persians their lands were made subject to the tribute. This may partly explain the frequent revolts which they maintained, with very considerable bravery against the Persian kings.

Herodotus enumerates five other *races* (so he calls them) or castes, besides priests and soldiers[5]— herdsmen, swineherds, tradesmen, interpreters, and pilots; an enumeration which perplexes us, inasmuch as

Different statements about the castes.

[1] Herodot. i. 165, 166; Diodôr. i. 73.
[2] Diodôr. i. 73.
[3] Besides this general rent or land-tax received by the Egyptian kings, there seem also to have been special crown-lands. Strabo mentions an island in the Nile (in the Thebaid) celebrated for the extraordinary excellence of its date-palms; the whole of this island belonged to the kings, without any other proprietor: it yielded a large revenue, and passed into the hands of the Roman government in Strabo's time (xvii. p. 818).
[4] Herodot. ii. 30—141.
[5] Herodot. i. 164.

it takes no account of the husbandmen, who must always have constituted the majority of the population. It is perhaps for this very reason that they are not comprised in the list—not standing out specially marked or congregated together, like the five above-named, and therefore not seeming to constitute a race apart. The distribution of Diodôrus, who specifies (over and above priests and soldiers) husbandmen, herdsmen, and artificers, embraces much more completely the whole population.[1] It seems more the statement of a reflecting man, pushing out the principle of hereditary occupations to its consequences (and the comments which the historian so abundantly interweaves with his narrative show that such was the character of the authorities which he followed)—while the list given by Herodotus comprises that which struck his observation. It seems that a certain proportion of the soil of the Delta consisted of marsh land, including pieces of habitable ground, but impenetrable to an invading enemy, and favourable only to the growth of papyrus and other aquatic plants. Other portions of the Delta, as well as of the upper valley in parts where it widened to the eastward, were too wet for the culture of grain, though producing the richest herbage, and eminently suitable to the race of Egyptian herdsmen, who thus divided the soil with the husbandmen.[2] Herdsmen generally were held reputable; but the race of swineherds were hated and despised, from the extreme antipathy of all other Egyptians to the pig—which animal yet could not be altogether proscribed, because there were certain peculiar occasions on which it was imperative to offer him in sacrifice to Selênê or Dionysus. Herodotus acquaints us that the swineherds were interdicted from all the temples, and that they always intermarried among themselves, other Egyptians disdaining such an alliance—a statement which indirectly intimates that there was no standing objection against intermarriage of the remaining castes with each other. The caste or race of interpreters began

[1] Diodôr. i. 74. About the Egyptian castes generally, see Heeren, Ideen über den Verkehr der Alten Welt, part ii. 2, p. 572—595.

[2] See the citation from Maillet's Travels in Egypt, in Heeren, Ideen, p. 590; also Volney's Travels, vol. i. ch. 6, p. 77.

The expression of Herodotus—οἱ περὶ τὴν σπειρομένην Αἴγυπτον οἰκεοῦσι—indicates that the portion of the soil used as pasture was not inconsiderable.

The inhabitants of the marsh lands were the most warlike part of the population (Thucyd. i. 110).

only with the reign of Psammetichus, from the admission of Greek settlers, then for the first time tolerated in the country. Though they were half Greeks, the historian does not note them as of inferior account, except as compared with the two ascendant castes of soldiers and priests. Moreover the creation of a new caste shows that there was no consecrated or unchangeable total number.

Large town population of Egypt.

Those whom Herodotus denominates tradesmen (κάπηλοι) are doubtless identical with the artisans (τεχνῖται) specified by Diodôrus—the town population generally as distinguished from that of the country. During the three months of the year when Egypt was covered with water, festival days were numerous—the people thronging by hundreds of thousands, in vast barges, to one or other of the many holy places, combining worship and enjoyment.[1] In Egypt weaving was a trade, whereas in Greece it was the domestic occupation of females. Herodotus treats it as one of those reversals of the order of nature which were seen only in Egypt,[2] that the weaver stayed at home plying his web while his wife went to market. The process of embalming bodies was elaborate and universal, giving employment to a large special class of men. The profusion of edifices, obelisks, sculpture, and painting, all executed by native workmen, required a large body of trained sculptors,[3] who in the mechanical branch of their business attained a high excellence. Most of the animals in Egypt were objects of religious reverence, and many of them were identified in the closest manner with

[1] Herodot. ii. 59, 60.

[2] Herodot. ii. 35; Sophokl. Œdip. Colôn. 332: where the passage cited by the Scholiast of Nymphodôrus is a remarkable example of the habit of ingenious Greeks to represent all customs which they thought worthy of notice, as having emanated from the design of some great sovereign; here Nymphodôrus introduces Sesostris as the author of the custom in question, in order that the Egyptians might be rendered effeminate.

[3] The process of embalming is minutely described (Herod. ii. 85—90; the word which he uses for it is the same as that for salting meat and fish —ταρίχευσις: compare Strabo, xvi. p. 764.

Perfectness of execution, mastery of the hardest stone, and undeviating obedience to certain rules of proportion, are general characteristics of Egyptian sculpture. There are yet seen in their quarries obelisks not severed from the rock, but having three of their sides already adorned with hieroglyphics; so certain were they of cutting off the fourth side with precision (Schnaase, Gesch. der Bild. Künste, i. p. 428).

All the Nomes of Egypt, however, were not harmonious in their feelings respecting animals: particular animals were worshipped in some Nomes, which in other Nomes were objects even of antipathy, especially the crocodile (Herod. ii. 69; Strabo, xvii. p. 817; see particularly the fifteenth Satire of Juvenal).

particular gods. The order of priests included a large number of hereditary feeders and tenders of these sacred animals.[1]

Among the sacerdotal order were also found the computers of genealogies, the infinitely subdivided practitioners in the art of healing, &c.,[2] who enjoyed good reputation, and were sent for as surgeons to Cyrus and Darius. The Egyptian city-population was thus exceedingly numerous, so that king Sethôs, when called upon to resist an invasion without the aid of the military caste, might well be supposed to have formed an army out of "the tradesmen, the artisans, and the market people".[3] And Alexandria, at the commencement of the dynasty of the Ptolemies, acquired its numerous and active inhabitants at the expense of Memphis and the ancient towns of Lower Egypt.

**Profound submission of the people.**

The mechanical obedience and fixed habits of the mass of the Egyptian population (not priests or soldiers) was a point which made much impression upon Grecian observers. Solôn is said to have introduced at Athens a custom prevalent in Egypt, whereby the Nomarch or chief of each Nome was required to investigate every man's means of living, and to punish with death those who did not furnish evidence of some recognised occupation.[4] It does not seem that the institution of Caste in Egypt—though ensuring unapproachable ascendency to the Priests and much consideration to the Soldiers—was attended with any such profound debasement to the rest as that which falls upon the lowest caste or Sudras in India. No such gulf existed between them as that between the Twice-born and the Once-born in the religion of Brahma. Yet those stupendous works, which form the permanent memorials of the country, remain at the same time as proofs of the oppressive exactions of the kings, and of the reckless caprice with which the lives as well as the contributions of the people were lavished. One hundred and twenty thousand Egyptians were said to have perished in

**Destructive toil imposed by the great monuments.**

[1] Herodot. ii. 65—72; Diodôr. i. 83—90; Plutarch, Isid. et Osir. p. 380.

Hasselquist identified all the birds carved on the Obelisk near Matarea (Heliopolis) (Travels in Egypt, p. 99).

[2] Herodot. ii. 82, 83; iii. 1, 129. It is one of the points of distinction between Egyptians and Babylonians that the latter had no surgeons or *ἰατροί*: they brought out the sick into the market-place to profit by the sympathy and advice of the passers-by (Herodot. i. 197).

[3] Herod. ii. 141.

[4] Herodot. iii 177.

the digging of the canal, which king Nekôs began but did not finish, between the Pelusian arm of the Nile and the Red Sea;[1] while the construction of the two great pyramids, attributed to the kings Cheops and Chephrên, was described to Herodotus by the priests as a period of exhausting labour and extreme suffering to the whole Egyptian people. And yet the great Labyrinth[2] (said to have been built by the Dodekarchs) appeared to him a more stupendous work than the Pyramids, so that the toil employed upon it cannot have been less destructive. The moving of such vast masses of stone as were seen in the ancient edifices both of Upper and Lower Egypt, with the imperfect mechanical resources then existing, must have tasked the efforts of the people yet more severely than the excavation of the half-finished canal of Nekôs. Indeed the associations with which the Pyramids were connected, in the minds of those with whom Herodotus conversed, were of the most odious character. Such vast works, Aristotle observes, are suitable to princes who desire to consume the strength and break the spirit of their people. With Greek despots, perhaps such an intention may have been sometimes deliberately conceived. But the Egyptian kings may be presumed to have followed chiefly caprice or love of pomp—sometimes views of a permanent benefit to be achieved—as in the canal of Nekôs and the vast reservoir of Mœris,[3] with its channel

[1] Herodot. ii. 158. Read the account of the foundation of Petersburg by Peter the Great:—"Au milieu de ces réformes, grandes et petites, qui faisaient les amusements du czar, et de la guerre terrible qui l'occupait contre Charles XII., il jeta les fondemens de l'importante ville et du port de Pétersbourg, en 1714, dans un marais où il n'y avait pas une cabane. Pierre travailla de ses mains à la première maison: rien ne le rebuta: des ouvriers furent forcés de venir sur ce bord de la mer Baltique, des frontières d'Astrachan, des bords de la Mer Noire et de la Mer Caspienne. Il périt plus de cent mille hommes dans les travaux qu'il fallut faire, et dans les fatigues et la disette qu'on essuya: mais en fin la ville existe." (Voltaire, Anecdotes sur Pierre le Grand, in his Œuvres Complètes, éd. Paris, 1825, tom. xxxi. p. 491).

[2] Herodot. ii. 124—129. *τὸν λέων τετρυμένον ἐς τὸ ἔσχατον κακοῦ.* (Diodôr. i. 63, 64.)

*Περὶ τῶν Πυραμίδων* (Diodôrus observes) *οὐδὲν ὅλως οὐδὲ παρὰ τοῖς ἐγχωρίοις, οὐδὲ παρὰ τοῖς συγγραφεῦσιν, συμφωνεῖται.* He then alludes to some of the discrepant stories about the date of the Pyramids, and the names of their constructors. This confession, of the complete want of trustworthy information respecting the most remarkable edifices of Lower Egypt, forms a striking contrast with the statement which Diodôrus had given (c. 44), that the priests possessed records, "continually handed down from reign to reign, respecting 470 Egyptian kings".

[3] It appears that the lake of Mœris is, at least in great part, a natural reservoir, though improved by art for the purposes wanted, and connected with the river by an artificial canal, sluices, &c. (Kenrick ad Herodot. ii. 149.)

"The lake still exists, of diminished magnitude, being about 60 miles in

joining the river—when they thus expended the physical strength and even the lives of their subjects.

Sanctity of animal life generally, veneration for particular animals in particular Nomes, and abstinence on religious grounds from certain vegetables, were among the marked features of Egyptian life, and served pre-eminently to impress upon the country that air of singularity which foreigners like Herodotus remarked in it. The two specially marked bulls, called Apis at Memphis and Mnevis at Heliopolis, seem to have enjoyed a sort of national worship.[1] The ibis, the cat, and the dog were throughout most of the Nomes venerated during life, embalmed like men after death, and if killed, avenged by the severest punishment of the offending party: but the veneration of the crocodile was confined to the neighbourhood of Thêbes and the lake of Mœris. Such veins of religious sentiment, which distinguished Egypt from Phœnicia and Assyria not less than from Greece, were explained by the native priests after their manner to Herodotus; though he declines from pious scruples to communicate what was told to him.[2] They seem remnants continued from a very early stage of Fetichism; and the attempts of different persons, noticed in Diodôrus and Plutarch, to account for their origin, partly by legends, partly by theory, will give little satisfaction to any one.[3]

Worship of animals.

Though Thêbes first and Memphis afterwards were undoubtedly the principal cities of Egypt, yet if the dynasties of Manetho are at all trustworthy even in their general outline, the Egyptian kings were not taken uniformly either from one or the other. Manetho enumerates on the whole twenty-six different dynasties

Egyptian kings—taken from different parts of the country.

circumference, but the communication with the Nile has ceased." Herodotus gives the circumference as 3600 stadia, =between 400 and 450 miles.

I incline to believe that there was more of the hand of man in it than Mr. Kenrick supposes, though doubtless the receptacle was natural.

[1] Herodot. ii. 38—46, 65—72; iii. 27—30; Diodôr. i. 83—90.

It is surprising to find Pindar introducing into one of his odes a plain mention of the monstrous circumstances connected with the worship of the goat in the Mendesian Nome (Pindar, Fragm. Inc. 179, ed. Bergk). Pindar had also dwelt, in one of his Prosodia, upon the mythe of the gods having disguised themselves as animals, when seeking to escape Typhôn: which was one of the tales told as an explanation of the consecration of animals in Egypt: see Pindar, Fragm. Inc. p. 61, ed. Bergk; Porphyr. de Abstinent. iii. p. 251, ed. Rhoer.

[2] Herodot. ii. 65. Diodôrus does not feel the same reluctance to mention these ἀπόῤῥητα (i. 86).

[3] Diodôr. i. 86, 87; Plutarch, De Isid. et Osirid. p. 377 *seq.*

or families of kings, anterior to the conquest of the country by Kambysês—the Persian kings between Kambysês and Darius Nothus, down to the death of the latter in 405 B.C. constituting his twenty-seventh dynasty. Of these twenty-six dynasties, beginning with the year 5702 B.C., the first two are Thinites—the third and fourth, Memphites—the fifth, from the island of Elephantinê—the sixth, seventh, and eighth, again Memphites—the ninth and tenth, Herakleopolites—the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth, Diospolites or Thebans—the fourteenth, Choïtes—the fifteenth and sixteenth, Hyksos or Shepherd Kings—the seventeenth, Shepherd Kings, overthrown and succeeded by Diospolites—the eighteenth (B.C. 1655—1327, in which is included Rameses the great Egyptian conqueror, identified by many authors with Sesostris, 1411 B.C.), nineteenth and twentieth, Diospolites—the twenth-first, Tanites—twenty-second, Bubastites—the twenty-third, again Tanites—the twenty-fourth, Saïtes—the twenty-fifth, Ethiopians, beginning with Sabakôn, whom Herodotus also mentions—the twenty-sixth, Saïtes, including Psammetichus, Nekôs, Apriês or Uaphris, and Amasis or Amosis.

We see by these lists that, according to the manner in which Manetho construed the antiquities of his country, several other cities of Egypt besides Thêbes and Memphis furnished kings to the whole territory. But we cannot trace any correspondence between the Nomes which furnished kings and those which Herodotus mentions to have been exclusively occupied by the military caste. Many of the separate Nomes were of considerable substantive importance, and had a marked local character each to itself, religious as well as political; though the whole of Egypt, from Elephantinê to Pelusium and Kanôpus, is said to have always constituted one kingdom, from the earliest times which the native priests could conceive.

Relations of Egypt with Assyria.

We are to consider this kingdom as engaged, long before the time when Greeks were admitted into it,[1] in a standing caravan commerce with Phœnicia, Palestine, Arabia, and Assyria. Ancient Egypt, having neither vines nor olives, imported both wine and oil;[2] while it also

[1] On this early trade between Egypt, Phœnicia, and Palestine, anterior to any acquaintance with the Greeks, see Josephus cont. Apion. i. 12.

[2] Herodotus notices the large importation of wine into Egypt in his

needed especially the frankincense and aromatic products peculiar to Arabia, for its elaborate religious ceremonies. Towards the last quarter of the eighth century B.C. (a little before the time when the dynasty of the Mermnadæ in Lydia was commencing in the person of Gygês), we trace events tending to alter the relation which previously subsisted between these countries, by continued aggressions on the part of the Assyrian monarchs of Nineveh—Salmaneser and Sennacherib. The former, having conquered and led into captivity the ten tribes of Israel, also attacked the Phœnician towns on the adjoining coast: Sidon, Palæ-Tyrus, and Akê yielded to him, but Tyre itself resisted, and having endured for five years the hardships of a blockade with partial obstruction of its continental aqueducts, was enabled by means of its insular position to maintain independence. It was just at this period that the Grecian establishments in Sicily were forming, and I have already remarked that the pressure of the Assyrians upon Phœnicia probably had some effect in determining that contraction of the Phœnician occupations in Sicily which really took place (B.C. 730—720). Respecting Sennacherib, we are informed by the Old Testament that he invaded Judæa—and by Herodotus (who calls him king of the Assyrians and Arabians) that he assailed the pious king Sethôs in Egypt: in both cases his army experienced a miraculous repulse and destruction. After this the Assyrians of Nineveh, either torn by intestine dissension, or shaken by the attacks of the Medes, appear no longer active; but about the year 630 B.C., the Assyrians or Chaldæans of Babylon manifest a formidable and increasing power. It is moreover during this century that the old routine of the Egyptian kings was broken through, and a new policy displayed towards foreigners by Psammetichus—which, while it rendered Egypt more formidable to Judæa and Phœnicia, opened to Grecian ships and settlers the hitherto inaccessible Nile.

Herodotus draws a marked distinction between the history of Egypt before Psammetichus and the following period. The

day, from all Greece as well as from Phœnicia, as well as the employment of the earthen vessels in which it had been brought for the transport of water, in the return journeys across the Desert (iii. 6).

In later times, Alexandria was supplied with wine chiefly from Laodikeia in Syria near the mouth of the Orontes (Strabo, xvi. p. 751).

former he gives as the narration of the priests, without professing to guarantee it—the latter he evidently believes to be well-ascertained.[1] And we find that from Psammetichus downward, Herodotus and Manetho are in tolerable harmony, whereas even for the sovereigns occupying the last fifty years before Psammetichus, there are many and irreconcilable discrepancies between them,[2] but they both agree in stating that Psammetichus reigned fifty-four years.

Egyptian history not known before Psammetichus.

So important an event as the first admission of the Greeks into Egypt, was made, by the informants of Herodotus, to turn upon two prophecies. After the death of Sethôs (priest of Hephæstos as well as king), who left no son, Egypt became divided among twelve kings, of whom Psammetichus was one. It was under this dodekarchy, according to Herodotus, that the marvellous labyrinth near the Lake of Mœris was constructed. The twelve lived and reigned for some time in perfect harmony. But a prophecy had been made known to them, that the one who should make libations in the temple of Hephæstos out of a brazen goblet would reign over all Egypt. Now it happened that one day when they all appeared armed in that temple to offer sacrifice, the high priest brought out by mistake only eleven golden goblets instead of twelve; and Psammetichus, left without a goblet, made use of his brazen helmet as a substitute. Being thus considered, though unintentionally, to have fulfilled the condition of the prophecy, by making libations in a brazen goblet, he became an object of terror to his eleven colleagues, who united to despoil him of his dignity and drove him into the inaccessible marshes. In this extremity he sent to seek counsel from the oracle of Lêtô at Butô, and received for answer an assurance that "vengeance would come to him by the hands of brazen men showing themselves from the seaward". His faith was for the moment shaken by so startling a conception as that of brazen men for his allies. But the prophetic veracity of the priest at Butô was speedily shown, when an astonished attendant

First introduction of Greeks into Egypt under Psammetichus—stories connected with it.

[1] Herodot. ii. 147—154. ἀπὸ Ψαμμητίχου—πάντα καὶ τὰ ὕστερον ἐπιστάμεθα ἀτρεκέως.

[2] See these differences stated and considered in Boeckh, Manetho und die Hundssternperiode, p. 326—336.

came to acquaint him in his lurking-place, that brazen men were ravaging the sea-coast of the Delta. It was a body of Ionian and Karian soldiers, who had landed for pillage; and the messenger who came to inform Psammetichus had never before seen men in an entire suit of brazen armour. That prince, satisfied that these were the allies whom the oracle had marked out for him, immediately entered into negotiation with the Ionians and Karians, enlisted them in his service, and by their aid in conjunction with his other partisans overpowered the other eleven kings, thus making himself the one ruler of Egypt.[1]

Importance of Grecian mercenaries to the Egyptian kings—caste of Interpreters.

Such was the tale by which the original alliance of an Egyptian king with Grecian mercenaries, and the first introduction of Greeks into Egypt, was accounted for and dignified. What followed is more authentic and more important. Psammetichus provided a settlement and lands for his new allies, on the Pelusiac or eastern branch of the Nile, a little below Bubastis. The Ionians were planted on one side of the river, the Karians on the other; and the place was made to serve as a military position, not only for the defence of the eastern border, but also for the support of the king himself against malcontents at home: it was called the Stratopeda, or the Camps.[2] He took pains moreover to facilitate the intercourse between them and the neighbouring inhabitants by causing a number of Egyptian children to be domiciled with them, in order to learn the Greek language. Hence sprung the Interpreters, who in the time of Herodotus constituted a permanent hereditary caste or breed.

Though the chief purpose of this first foreign settlement in Egypt, between Pelusium and Bubastis, was to create an independent military force, and with it a fleet, for the king,—yet it

[1] Herodot. ii. 149—152. This narrative of Herodotus, however little satisfactory in an historical point of view, bears evident marks of being the genuine tale which he heard from the priests of Hephæstos. Diodôrus gives an account more historically plausible, but he could not well have had any positive authorities for that period, and he gives us seemingly the ideas of Greek authors of the days of the Ptolemies. Psammetichus (he tells us), as one of the twelve kings, ruled at Saïs and in the neighbouring part of the Delta; he opened a trade, previously unknown in Egypt, with Greeks and Phœnicians, so profitable that his eleven colleagues became jealous of his riches and combined to attack him. He raised an army of foreign mercenaries and defeated his colleagues (Diodôr. i. 66, 67). Polyænus gives a different story about Psammetichus and the Karian mercenaries (vii. 3).

[2] Herodot. ii. 154.

was of course an opening both for communication and traffic, to all Greeks and to all Phœnicians, such as had never before been available. And it was speedily followed by the throwing open of the Kanôpic or westernmost branch of the river for the purposes of trade specially. According to a statement of Strabo, it was in the reign of Psammetichus that the Milesians with a fleet of thirty ships made a descent on that part of the coast, first built a fort in the immediate neighbourhood, and then presently founded the town of Naukratis on the right bank of the Kanôpic Nile. There is much that is perplexing in this affirmation of Strabo; but on the whole I am inclined to think that the establishment of the Greek factories and merchants at Naukratis may be considered as dating in the reign of Psammetichus[1]—Naukratis however must have been a city of Egyptian origin in which these foreigners were permitted to take up their abode—not a Greek colony, as Strabo would have us believe. The language of Herodotus seems rather to imply that it was king Amasis (between whom and the death of Psammetichus there intervened nearly half a century) who first

Opening of the Kanôpic branch of the Nile to Greek commerce —Greek establishment at Naukratis.

[1] Strabo, xvii. p. 801. καὶ τὸ Μιλησίων τεῖχος· πλεύσαντες γὰρ ἐπὶ ψαμμητίχου τριάκοντα νανσὶν Μιλήσιοι κατὰ Κυαξάρη (οὗτος δὲ τῶν Μήδων) κατέσχον εἰς τὸ Βολβίτινον· εἶτ' ἐκβάντες ἐτείχισαν τὸ λεχθὲν κτίσμα· χρόνῳ δ' ἀναπλεύσαντες εἰς τὸν Σαϊτικὸν νομὸν, καταναμαχήσαντες Ἴναρον, πόλιν ἔκτισαν Ναύκρατιν οὐ πολὺ τῆς Σχεδίας ὑπερθεν.

What is meant by the allusion to Kyaxarês, or to Inarus, in this passage, I do not understand. We know nothing of any relations either between Kyaxarês and Psammetichus, or between Kyaxarês and the Milesians: moreover, if by κατὰ Κυαξάρη be meant *in the time of Kyaxarês*, as the translators render it, we have in immediate succession ἐπὶ Ψαμμητίχου—κατὰ Κυαξάρη, with the same meaning, which is (to say the least of it) a very awkward sentence. The words οὗτος δὲ τῶν Μήδων look not unlike a comment added by some early reader of Strabo, who could not understand why Kyaxarês should be here mentioned, and who noted his difficulty in words which have subsequently found their way into the text. Then again *Inarus* belongs to the period between the Persian and Peloponnesian wars; at least we know no other person of that name than the chief of the Egyptian revolt against Persia (Thucyd. i. 114). who is spoken of as a "Libyan, the son of Psammetichus". The mention of Kyaxarês therefore here appears unmeaning, while that of Inarus is an anachronism: possibly the story that the Milesians founded Naukratis "after having worsted Inarus in a sea-fight," may have grown out of the etymology of the name Naukratis, in the mind of one who found Inarus the son of Psammetichus mentioned two centuries afterwards, and identified the two Psammetichuses with each other.

The statement of Strabo has been copied by Steph. Byz. v. Ναύκρατις. Eusebius also announces (Chron. i. p. 168) the Milesians as the founders of Naukratis, but puts the event at 753 B.C., during what he calls the Milesian thalassokraty: see Mr. Fynes Clinton ad ann. 732 B.C. in the Fasti Hellenici.

allowed Greeks to settle at Naukratis. Yet on comparing what the historian tells us respecting the courtezan Rhodôpis and the brother of Sapphô the poetess, it is evident that there must have been both Greek trade and Greek establishments in that town long before Amasis came to the throne. We may consider then that both the eastern and western mouths of the Nile became open to the Greeks in the days of Psammetichus: the former as leading to the head-quarters of the mercenary Greek troops in Egyptian pay—the latter for purposes of trade.

While this event afforded to the Greeks a valuable enlargement both of their traffic and of their field of observation, it seems to have occasioned an internal revolution in Egypt. The Nome of Bubastis, in which the new military settlement of foreigners was planted, is numbered among those occupied by the Egyptian military caste.[1] Whether their lands were in part taken away from them we do not know; but the mere introduction of such foreigners must have appeared an abomination to the strong conservative feeling of ancient Egypt. And Psammetichus treated the native soldiers in a manner which showed of how much less account Egyptian soldiers had become, since the "brazen helmets" had got footing in the land. It had hitherto been the practice to distribute such portions of the military as were on actual service, in three different posts: at Daphnê near Pelusium, on the north-eastern frontier—at Marea on the north-western frontier, near the spot where Alexandria was afterwards built—and at Elephantinê, on the southern or Ethiopian boundary. Psammetichus, having no longer occasion for their services on the eastern frontier, since the formation of the mercenary camp, accumulated them in greater number and detained them for an unusual time at the two other stations, especially at Elephantinê. Here, as Herodotus tells us, they remained for three years unrelieved. Diodôrus adds that Psammetichus assigned to those native troops who fought conjointly with the mercenaries, the least honourable post in the line. Discontent at length impelled them to emigrate in a body of 240,000 men into Ethiopia, leaving their wives and children behind in Egypt. No

Discontents and mutiny of the Egyptian military order.

[1] Herodot. ii. 166.

instances on the part of Psammetichus could induce them to return. This memorable incident,[1] which is said to have given rise to a settlement in the southernmost regions of Ethiopia, called by the Greeks the Automoli (though the emigrant soldiers still call themselves by their old Egyptian name), attests the effect produced by the introduction of the foreign mercenaries in lowering the position of the native military. The number of the emigrants however is a point noway to be relied upon. We shall presently see that there were enough of them left behind to renew effectively the struggle for their lost dignity.

It was probably with his Ionian and Karian troops that Psammetichus carried on those warlike operations in Syria which filled so large a proportion of his long and prosperous reign of fifty-four years.[2] He besieged the city of Azôtus in Syria for twenty-nine years, until he took it — the longest blockade which Herodotus had ever heard of. Moreover he was in that country when the destroying Scythian Nomads (who had defeated the Median king Kyaxarês and possessed themselves of Upper Asia) advanced to invade Egypt; a project which Psammetichus, by large presents, induced them to abandon.[3]

There were, however, yet more powerful enemies, against whom he and his son Nekôs (who succeeded him seemingly about 604 B.C.[4]) had to contend in Syria and the lands adjoining. It is

[1] Herodot. ii. 30; Diodôr. i. 67.

[2] Ἀπρίης—ὃς μετὰ Ψαμμήτιχον τὸν ἑωϋτοῦ προπάτορα ἐγένετο εὐδαιμονέστατος τῶν πρότερον βασιλέων (Herodot. ii. 161).

[3] Herodot. i. 105; ii. 157.

[4] The chronology of the Egyptian kings from Psammetichus to Amasis is given in some points differently by Herodotus and by Manetho:—

| According to Herodotus, | | According to Manetho ap. African., | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Psammetichus reigned | 54 years. | Psammetichus reigned | 54 years. |
| Nekôs . . . „ | 16 „ | Nechao II. . „ | 6 „ |
| Psammis . . „ | 6 „ | Psammathis . „ | 6 „ |
| Apriês . . . „ | 25 „ | Uaphris. . . „ | 19 „ |
| Amasis . . . „ | 44 „ | Amosis . . . „ | 44 „ |

Diodôrus gives 22 years for Apriês and 55 years for Amasis (i. 68).

Now the end of the reign of Amasis stands fixed for 526 B.C., and therefore the beginning of his reign (according to both Herodotus and Manetho) to 570 B.C. or 569 B.C. According to the chronology of the Old Testament, the battles of Megiddo and Carchemisch, fought by Nekôs, fall about 609—605 B.C., and this coincides with the reign of Nekôs as dated by Herodotus, but not as dated by Manetho. On the other hand, it appears from the evidence of certain Egyptian inscriptions recently discovered, that the real interval from the beginning of Nechao to the end of Uaphris is only forty years, and not forty-seven years, as the dates of Herodotus would make it (Boeckh, Manetho und die Hundssternperiode, p. 341—348), which

just at this period, during the reigns of Nabopolassar and his son Nebuchadnezzar (B.C. 625—561) that the Chaldæans or Assyrians of Babylon appear at the maximum of their power and aggressive disposition: while the Assyrians of Ninus or Nineveh lose their substantive position through the taking of that town by Kyaxarês (about B.C. 600)—the greatest height which the Median power ever reached. Between the Egyptian Nekôs and his grandson Apriês (Pharaoh Necho and Pharaoh Hophra of the Old Testament) on the one side, and the Babylonian Nebuchadnezzar on the other, Judæa and Phœnicia form the intermediate subject of quarrel. The political independence of the Phœnician towns is extinguished never again to be recovered. At the commencement of his reign, it appears, Nekôs was chiefly anxious to extend the Egyptian commerce, for which purpose he undertook two measures, both of astonishing boldness for that age—a canal between the lower part of the eastern or Pelusiac Nile and the inmost corner of the Red Sea—and the circumnavigation of Africa; his great object being to procure a water-communication between the Mediterranean and the Red Sea. He began the canal (much about the same time as Nebuchadnezzar executed his canal from Babylon to Terêdon) with such reckless determination, that 120,000 Egyptians are said to have perished in the work. But either from such disastrous proof of the difficulty, or (as Herodotus represents) from the terrors of a menacing prophecy which reached him, he was compelled to desist. Next he accomplished the circumnavigation of Africa, already above alluded to; but in this way too he found it impracticable to procure any available communication such as he wished.[1] It

Nekôs—son of Psammetichus—his active operations.

would place the accession of Nekôs in 610 or 609 B.C. Boeckh discusses at some length this discrepancy of dates, and inclines to the supposition that Nekôs reigned nine or ten years jointly with his father, and that Herodotus has counted these nine or ten years twice, once in the reign of Psammetichus, once in that of Nekôs. Certainly Psammetichus can hardly have been very young when his reign began, and if he reigned fifty-four years, he must have reached an extreme old age, and may have been prominently aided by his son. Adopting the suppositions therefore that the last ten years of the reign of Psammetichus may be reckoned both for him and for Nekôs—that for Nekôs separately only six years are to be reckoned—and that the number of years from the beginning of Nekôs's separate reign to the end of Uaphris is forty—Boeckh places the beginning of Psammetichus in 654 B.C., and not in 670 B.C., as the data of Herodotus would make it (*ib.* p. 342—350).

Mr. Clinton, Fast. Hellen. B.C. 616, follows Herodotus.

[1] Herodot. ii. 158. Respecting the canal of Nekôs, see the explanation of

is plain that in both these enterprises he was acting under Phœnician and Greek instigation; and we may remark that the point of the Nile, from whence the canal took its departure, was close upon the mercenary camps or Stratopeda. Being unable to connect the two seas together, he built and equipped an armed naval force both upon the one and the other, and entered upon aggressive enterprizes, naval as well as military. His army, on marching into Syria, was met at Megiddo (Herodotus says Magdolum) by Josiah king of Judah, who was himself slain and so completely worsted, that Jerusalem fell into the power of the conqueror, and became tributary to Egypt. It deserves to be noted that Nekôs sent the raiment which he had worn on the day of this victory as an offering to the holy temple of Apollo at Branchidæ near Milêtus[1] — the first recorded instance of a donation from an Egyptian king to a Grecian temple, and a proof that Hellenic affinities were beginning to take effect upon him. Probably we may conclude that a large proportion of his troops were Milesians.

But the victorious career of Nekôs was completely checked by the defeat which he experienced at Carchemisch (or Circesium) on the Euphrates, from Nebuchadnezzar and the Babylonians, who not only drove him out of Judea and Syria but also took Jerusalem, and carried away the king and the principal Jews into captivity.[2] Nebuchadnezzar farther attacked the Phœnician cities, and the siege of Tyre alone cost him severe toil for thirteen years. After this long and gallant resistance, the Tyrians were forced to submit, and underwent the same fate as the Jews. Their princes and chiefs were dragged captive into the Babylonian territory, and the Phœnician cities

Defeated by Nebuchadnezzar at Carchemisch.

Mr. Kenrick on this chapter of Herodotus. From Bubastis to Suez the length would be about ninety miles.

[1] Herodot. ii. 159. Diodôrus makes no mention of Nekôs.

The account of Herodotus coincides in the main with the history of the Old Testament about Pharaoh Necho and Josiah. The great city of Syria which he calls Κάδυτις seems to be Jerusalem, though Wesseling (ad Herodot. iii. 5) and other able critics dispute the identity. See Volney, Recherches sur l'Hist. Anc. vol. ii. ch. 13, p. 239: "Les Arabes ont conservé l'habitude d'appeler Jérusalem la Sainte par excellence, *el Qods*. Sans doute les Chaldéens et les Syriens lui donnèrent le même nom, qui dans leur dialecte est *Qadouta*, dont Hérodote rend bien l'orthographie quand il écrit Κάδυτις."

[2] Jeremiah, xlvi. 2; 2nd book of Kings, xxiii. and xxiv.; Josephus, Ant. J. x. 5, 1; x. 6, 1.

About Nebuchadnezzar, see the Fragment of Berosus ap. Joseph. cont. Apion. i. 19, 20, and Antiq. J. x. 11, 1, and Beros. Fragment. ed. Richter, p. 65—67.

became numbered among the tributaries of Nebuchadnezzar. So they seem to have remained, until the overthrow of Babylon by Cyrus: for we find among those extracts (unhappily very brief) which Josephus has preserved out of the Tyrian annals, that during this interval there were disputes and irregularities in the government of Tyre[1]—judges being for a time substituted in the place of kings; while Merbal and Hirom, two princes of the regal Tyrian line, detained captive in Babylonia, were successively sent down on the special petition of the Tyrians, and reigned at Tyre; the former four years, the latter twenty years, until the conquest of Babylon by Cyrus. The Egyptian king Apriês, indeed, son of Psammis and grandson of Nekôs, attacked Sidon and Tyre both by land and sea, but seemingly without any result.[2] To the Persian empire, as soon as Cyrus had conquered Babylon, they cheerfully and spontaneously submitted,[3] whereby the restoration of the captive Tyrians to their home was probably conceded to them, like that of the captive Jews.

Psammis, son of Nekôs—Apriês.

Nekôs in Egypt was succeeded by his son Psammis, and he again, after a reign of six years, by his son Apriês; of whose power and prosperity Herodotus speaks in very high general terms, though the few particulars which he recounts are of a contrary tenor. It was not till after a reign of twenty-five years that Apriês undertook

[1] Menander ap. Joseph. Antiq. J. ix. 14, 2. ἐπὶ Εἰθωβάλου τοῦ βασιλέως ἐπολιόρκησε Ναβουχοδονόσορος τὴν Τύρον ἐπ' ἔτη δεκάτρια. That this siege of thirteen years ended in the storming, capitulation, or submission (we know not which, and Volney goes beyond the evidence when he says, "Les Tyriens furent emportés *d'assaut* par le roi de Babylone," Recherches sur l'Histoire Ancienne, vol. ii. ch. 14, p. 250) of Tyre to the Chaldæan king, is quite certain from the mention which afterwards follows of the Tyrian princes being detained captive in Babylonia. Hengstenberg (De Rebus Tyriorum, p. 34—77) heaps up a mass of arguments, most of them very inconclusive, to prove this point, about which the passage cited by Josephus from Menander leaves no doubt. What is *not* true is, that Tyre was destroyed and laid desolate by Nebuchadnezzar: still less can it be believed that that king conquered Egypt and Libya, as Megasthenes, and even Berosus so far as Egypt is concerned, would have us believe—the argument of Larcher ad Herodot. ii. 168 is anything but satisfactory. The defeat of the Egyptian king at Carchemisch, and the stripping him of his foreign possessions in Judæa and Syria, have been exaggerated into a conquest of Egypt itself.

[2] Herodot. ii. 161. He simply mentions what I have stated in the text; while Diodôrus tells us (i. 68) that the Egyptian king took Sidon by assault, terrified the other Phœnician towns into submission, and defeated the Phœnicians and Cyprians in a great naval battle, acquiring a vast spoil.

What authority Diodôrus here followed, I do not know; but the measured statement of Herodotus is far the most worthy of credit.

[3] Herodot. iii. 19.

that expedition against the Greek colonies in Libya—Kyrênê and Barka—which proved his ruin. The native Libyan tribes near those cities having sent to surrender themselves to him and entreat his aid against the Greek settlers, Apriês despatched to them a large force composed of native Egyptians; who (as has been before mentioned) were stationed on the north-western frontier of Egypt, and were therefore most available for the march against Kyrênê. The Kyrenean citizens advanced to oppose them, and a battle ensued in which the Egyptians were completely routed with severe loss. It is affirmed that they were thrown into disorder from want of practical knowledge of Grecian warfare[1]—a remarkable proof of the entire isolation of the Grecian mercenaries (who had now been long in the service of Psammetichus and his successors) from the native Egyptians.

This disastrous reverse provoked a mutiny in Egypt against Apriês, the soldiers contending that he had despatched them on the enterprise with a deliberate view to their destruction, in order to assure his rule over the remaining Egyptians. The malcontents found so much sympathy among the general population, that Amasis, a Saïtic Egyptian of low birth but of considerable intelligence, whom Apriês had sent to conciliate them, was either persuaded or constrained to become their leader, and prepared to march immediately against the king at Saïs. Unbounded and reverential submission to the royal authority was a habit so deeply rooted in the Egyptian mind, that Apriês could not believe the resistance to be serious. He sent an officer of consideration named Patarbêmis to bring Amasis before him. When Patarbêmis returned, bringing back from the rebel nothing better than a contemptuous refusal to appear except at the head of an army, the exasperated king ordered his nose and ears to be cut off. This act of atrocity caused such indignation among the Egyptians round him, that most of them deserted and joined the revolters, who thus became irresistibly formidable in point of numbers. There yet remained to Apriês the foreign mercenaries—thirty thousand Ionians and Karians—whom he summoned from their Stratopeda on the Pelusiac Nile to his residence at Saïs. This force, the creation of his ancestor Psammetichus and the main

[1] Herodot. ii. 161; iv. 159.

reliance of his family, still inspired him with such unabated confidence, that he marched to attack the far superior numbers under Amasis at Momemphis. Though his troops behaved with bravery, the disparity of numbers, combined with the excited feeling of the insurgents, overpowered him: he was defeated and carried prisoner to Saïs, where at first Amasis not only spared his life, but treated him with generosity.[1] Such however was the antipathy of the Egyptians, that they forced Amasis to surrender his prisoner into their hands, and immediately strangled him.

Amasis—dethrones Apriês by means of the native soldiers.

It is not difficult to trace in these proceedings the outbreak of a long-suppressed hatred on the part of the Egyptian soldier-caste towards the dynasty of Psammetichus, to whom they owed their comparative degradation, and by whom that stream of Hellenism had been let in upon Egypt which doubtless was not witnessed without great repugnance. It might seem also that this dynasty had too little of pure Egyptianism in them to find favour with the priests. At least Herodotus does not mention any religious edifices erected either by Nekôs or Psammis or Apriês, though he describes much of such outlay on the part of Psammetichus—who built magnificent Propylæa to the temple of Hephæstos at Memphis,[2] and a splendid new chamber or stable for the sacred bull Apis—and more still on the part of Amasis.

Nevertheless Amasis, though he had acquired the crown by this explosion of native antipathy, found the foreign adjuncts so eminently advantageous, that he not only countenanced, but multiplied them. Egypt enjoyed under him a decree of power and consideration such as it neither before possessed nor afterwards retained—for his long reign of forty-four years (570--526 B.C.) closed just six months before the Persian conquest of the country. As he was eminently phil-Hellenic, the Greek merchants at Naukratis—the permanent settlers as well as the occasional visitors —obtained from him valuable enlargement of their privileges. Besides granting permission to various Grecian towns to erect religious establishments for such of their citizens as visited the place, he also sanctioned the

Amasis encourages Grecian commerce.

Important factory and religious establishment for the Greeks at Naukratis.

[1] Herodot. ii. 162—169; Diodôr. i. 68.

[2] Herodot. ii. 153.

constitution of a formal and organised emporium or factory, invested with commercial privileges, and armed with authority exercised by presiding officers regularly chosen. This factory was connected with, and probably grew out of, a large religious edifice and precinct, built at the joint cost of nine Grecian cities: four of them Ionic,—Chios, Teôs, Phôkæa, and Klazomenæ; four Doric,—Rhodes, Knidus, Halikarnassus, and Phasêlis; and one Æolic,—Mitylênê. By these nine cities the joint temple and factory was kept up and its presiding magistrates chosen. But its destination, for the convenience of Grecian commerce generally, seems revealed by the imposing title of *The Hellênion*. Samos, Milêtus, and Ægina had each founded a separate temple at Naukratis for the worship of such of their citizens as went there; probably connected (as the Hellênion was) with protection and facilities for commercial purposes. While these three powerful cities had thus constituted each a factory for itself, as guarantee to the merchandise, and as responsible for the conduct of its own citizens separately—the corporation of the Hellênion served both as protection and control to all other Greek merchants. And such was the usefulness, the celebrity, and probably the pecuniary profit, of the corporation, that other Grecian cities set up claims to a share in it, falsely pretending to have contributed to the original foundation.[1]

Naukratis was for a long time the privileged port for Grecian commerce with Egypt. No Greek merchant was permitted to deliver goods in any other part, or to enter any other of the mouths of the Nile except the Kanôpic. If forced into any of them by stress of weather, he was compelled to make oath that his arrival was a matter of necessity, and to convey his goods round by sea into the Kanôpic branch to Naukratis. If the weather still forbade such a proceeding, the merchandise was put into barges and conveyed round to Naukratis by the internal

[1] Herodot. ii. 178. The few words of the historian about these Greek establishments at Naukratis are highly valuable, and we can only wish that he had told us more: he speaks of them in the present tense, from personal knowledge—*τὸ μὲν νῦν μέγιστον αὐτῶν τέμενος καὶ οὐνομαστότατον ἐὸν καὶ χρησιμώτατον, καλεύμενον δὲ Ἑλλήνιον, αἵδε πόλις εἰσὶ αἱ ἱδρυμέναι κοινῇ·—τούτων μέν ἐστι τοῦτο τὸ τέμενος, καὶ προστάτας τοῦ ἐμπορίου αὗται αἱ πόλις εἰσὶ αἱ παρέχουσαι. ὅσαι δὲ ἄλλαι πόλις μεταποιεῦνται, οὐδέν σφι μετεὸν μεταποιεῦνται.*

We are here let into a vein of commercial jealousy between the Greek cities about which we should have been glad to be farther informed.

canals of the Delta. Such a monopoly, which made Naukratis in Egypt something like Canton in China or Nangasaki in Japan, no longer subsisted in the time of Herodotus.[1] But the factory of the Hellênion was in full operation and dignity, and very probably he himself, as a native of one of the contributing cities, Halikarnassus, may have profited by its advantages. At what precise time Naukratis first became licensed for Grecian trade, we cannot directly make out. But there seems reason to believe that it was the port to which the Greek merchants first went, so soon as the general liberty of trading with the country was conceded to them: and this would put the date of such grant at least as far back as the foundation of Kyrênê and the voyage of the fortunate Kôlæus, who was on his way with a cargo to Egypt when the storms overtook him—about 630 B.C., during the reign of Psammetichus. And in the time of the poetess Sapphô and her brother Charaxus, it seems evident that Greeks had been some time established at Naukratis.[2] But Amasis, though his predecessors had permitted such establishment, may doubtless be regarded as having given organisation to the factories, and as having placed the Greeks on a more comfortable footing of security than they had ever enjoyed before.

[1] Herodot. ii. 179. Ἦν δὲ τὸ παλαιὸν μούνη ἡ Ναύκρατις ἐμπόριον, καὶ ἄλλο οὐδὲν Αἰγύπτου . . . οὕτω δὴ Ναύκρατις ἐτετίμητο.

[2] The beautiful Thracian courtezan, Rhodôpis, was purchased by a Samian merchant named Xanthês, and conveyed to Naukratis, in order that he might make money by her (κατ' ἐργασίην). The speculation proved a successful one, for Charaxus, brother of Sappho, going to Naukratis with a cargo of wine, became so captivated with Rhodôpis, that he purchased her for a very large sum of money, and gave her her freedom. She then carried on her profession at Naukratis on her own account, and realised a handsome fortune, the tithe of which she employed in a votive offering at Delphi. She acquired so much renown, that the Egyptian Greeks ascribed to her the building of one of the pyramids,—a supposition on the absurdity of which Herodotus makes proper comments, but which proves the great celebrity of the name of Rhodôpis (Herodot. ii. 134). Athenæus calls her Dôrichê, and distinguishes her from Rhodôpis (xiii. p. 596, compare Suidas v. Ῥοδωπίδος ἀνάθημα). When Charaxus returned to Mitylênê, his sister Sappho composed a song, in which she greatly derided him for this proceeding—a song which doubtless Herodotus knew, and which gives to the whole anecdote a complete authenticity.

Now we can hardly put the age of Sappho lower than 600—580 B.C. (see Mr. Clinton, Fasti Hellen. ad ann. 595 B.C., and Ulrici, Geschichte der Griech. Lyrik, ch. xxiii. p. 360): Alkæus, too, her contemporary, had himself visited Egypt (Alcæi Fragm. 103, ed. Bergk; Strabo, i. p. 63). The Greek settlement at Naukratis therefore must be decidedly older than Amasis, who began to reign in 570 B.C., and the residence of Rhodôpis in that town must have begun earlier than Amasis, though Herodotus calls her κατ' Ἄμασιν ἀκμάζουσα (ii. 134). We cannot construe the language of Herodotus strictly, when he says that it was Amasis who *permitted* the residence of Greeks at Naukratis (ii. 178).

This Egyptian king manifested several other evidences of his phil-Hellenic disposition by donations to Delphi and other Grecian temples. He even married a Grecian wife from the city of Kyrênê.[1] Moreover he was in intimate alliance and relations of hospitality both with Polykratês despot of Samos and with Crœsus king of Lydia.[2] He conquered the island of Cyprus, and rendered it tributary to the Egyptian throne. His fleet and army were maintained in good condition, and the foreign mercenaries, the great strength of the dynasty whom he had supplanted, were not only preserved, but even removed from their camp near Pelusium to the chief town Memphis, where they served as the special guards of Amasis.[3] Egypt enjoyed under him a degree of power abroad and prosperity at home (the river having been abundant in its overflowing), which was the more tenaciously remembered on account of the period of disaster and subjugation immediately following his death. And his contributions, in architecture and sculpture, to the temples of Saïs[4] and Memphis were on a scale of vastness surpassing everything before known in Lower Egypt.

Prosperity of Egypt under Amasis.

[1] Herodot. ii. 181.
[2] Herodot. i. 77; iii. 39.
[3] Herodot. ii. 182, 154. κατοίκισε ἐς Μέμφιν, φυλακὴν ἑωυτοῦ ποιεύμενος πρὸς Αἰγυπτίων.
[4] Herodot. ii. 175—177.

# CHAPTER XXI.

## DECLINE OF THE PHŒNICIANS.—GROWTH OF CARTHAGE.

THE preceding sketch of that important system of foreign nations —Phœnicians, Assyrians, and Egyptians—who occupied the south-eastern portion of the (*οἰκουμένη*) inhabited world of an early Greek, brings them down nearly to the time at which they were all absorbed into the mighty Persian empire. In tracing the series of events which intervened between 700 B.C. and 530 B.C., we observe a material increase of power both in the Chaldæans and Egyptians, and an immense extension of Grecian maritime activity and commerce—but we at the same time notice the decline of Tyre and Sidon, both in power and traffic. The arms of Nebuchadnezzar reduced the Phœnician cities to the same state of dependence as that which the Ionian cities underwent half a century later from Crœsus and Cyrus; while the ships of Milêtus, Phôkæa, and Samos gradually spread over all those waters of the Levant which had once been exclusively Phœnician. In the year 704 B.C., the Samians did not yet possess a single trireme:[1] down to the year 630 B.C., not a single Greek vessel had yet visited Libya. But when we reach 550 B.C., we find the Ionic ships predominant in the Ægean, and those of Corinth and Korkyra in force to the west of Peloponnêsus —we see the flourishing cities of Kyrênê and Barka already rooted in Libya, and the port of Naukratis a busy emporium of Grecian commerce with Egypt. The trade by land—which is all that Egypt had enjoyed prior to Psammetichus, and which was exclusively conducted by Phœnicians—is exchanged for a trade

Between 700—530 B.C. Decline of the Phœnicians—growth of Grecian marine and commerce.

[1] Thucyd. i. 13.

by sea, of which the Phœnicians have only a share, and seemingly a smaller share than the Greeks. Moreover the conquest by Amasis of the island of Cyprus, half-filled with Phœnician settlements and once the tributary dependency of Tyre, affords an additional mark of the comparative decline of that great city. In her commerce with the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf she still remained without a competitor, the schemes of the Egyptian king Nekôs having proved abortive. Even in the time of Herodotus, the spices and frankincense of Arabia were still brought and distributed only by the Phœnician merchant.[1] But on the whole, both political and industrial development of Tyre are now cramped by impediments, and kept down by rivals, not before in operation; so that the part which she will be found to play in the Mediterranean, throughout the whole course of this history, is one subordinate and of reduced importance.

The course of Grecian history is not directly affected by these countries. Yet their effect upon the Greek mind was very considerable, and the opening of the Nile by Psammetichus constitutes an epoch in Hellenic thought. It supplied to their observation a large and diversified field of present reality, while it was at the same time one great source of those mysticising tendencies which corrupted so many of their speculative minds. But to Phœnicia and Assyria, the Greeks owe two acquisitions well-deserving special mention—the alphabet, and the first standard and scale of weight as well as coined money. Of neither of these acquisitions can we trace the precise date. That the Greek alphabet is derived from the Phœnician, the analogy of the two proves beyond dispute, though we know not how or where the inestimable present was handed over, of which no traces are to be found in the Homeric poems.[2]

Effect of Phœnicians, Assyrians, and Egyptians on the Greek mind. The alphabet —The scale of money and weight.

[1] Herodot. iii. 107.

[2] The various statements or conjectures to be found in Greek authors (all comparatively recent) respecting the origin of the Greek alphabet, are collected by Franz, Epigraphicê Græca, s. iii. pp. 12—20: "Omnino Græci alphabeti ut certa primordia sunt in origine Phœniciâ, ita certus terminus in litteraturâ Ionicâ seu Simonideâ. Quæ inter utrumque a veteribus ponuntur, incerta omnia et fabulosa . . . . Non commoramur in iis quæ de litterarum origine et propagatione ex fabulosâ Pelasgorum historiâ (cf. Knight. p. 119—123; Raoul Rochette, p. 67—87) neque in iis quæ de Cadmo narrantur, quem unquam fuisse hodie jam nemo crediderit . . . . Alphabeti Phœnicii omnes 22 literas cum antiquis Græcis congruere, hodie nemo est qui ignoret" (p. 14, 15). Franz gives valuable information respecting the changes gradually introduced into the

The Latin alphabet, which is nearly identical with the most ancient Doric variety of the Greek, was derived from the same source—also the Etruscan alphabet, though (if O. Müller is correct in his conjecture) only at second-hand through the intervention of the Greek.[1] If we cannot make out at what time the Phœnicians made this valuable communication to the Greeks, much less can we determine when or how they acquired it themselves—whether it be of Semitic invention, or derived from improvement upon the phonetic hieroglyphics of the Egyptians.[2]

Besides the letters of the Alphabet, the scale of weight and that of coined money passed from Phœnicia and Assyria into Greece. It has been shown by Boeckh in his "Metrologie" that the Æginæan scale[3]—with its divisions, talent, mna, and obolus—is identical with the Babylonian and Phœnician; and that the word *Mna*, which forms the central point of the scale, is of Chaldæan origin. On this I have already touched in a former chapter, while relating the history of Pheidôn of Argos, by whom what is called the Æginæan scale was first promulgated.

The gnomon—and the division of the day.

In tracing therefore the effect upon the Greek mind, of early intercourse with the various Asiatic nations, we find that as the Greeks made up their musical scale (so important an element of their early mental culture) in part by borrowing from Lydians and Phrygians—so also their monetary and statical system, their alphabetical writing, and their duodecimal division of the day measured by the gnomon and the shadow, were all derived from Assyrians and Phœnicians. The early industry and commerce of these countries were thus in many ways available to Grecian advance, and would probably

Greek alphabet, and the erroneous statements of the Grammatici as to what letters were original, and what were subsequently added.

Kruse also in his "Hellas" (vol. i. p. 13, and in the first Beylage, annexed to that volume) presents an instructive comparison of the Greek, Latin, and Phœnician alphabets.

The Greek authors, as might be expected, were generally much more fond of referring the origin of letters to native heroes or gods, such as Palamêdês, Promêtheus, Musæus, Orpheus, Linus, &c., than to the Phœnicians. The oldest known statement (that of Stesichorus, Schol. ap. Bekker. Anecdot. ii. p. 786) ascribes them to Palamedês.

Both Franz and Kruse contend strenuously for the existence and habit of writing among the Greeks in times long anterior to Homer; in which I dissent from them.

[1] See O. Müller, Die Etrusker (iv. 6), where there is much instruction on the Tuscan alphabet.

[2] This question is raised and discussed by Justus Olshausen, Ueber den Ursprung des Alphabetes (p. 1—10), in the Kieler Philologische Studien, 1841.

[3] See Boeckh, Metrologie, ch. iv.—vi.; also the preceding volume of this History.

have become more so if the great and rapid rise of the more barbarous Persians had not reduced them all to servitude. The Phœnicians, though unkind rivals, were at the same time examples and stimulants to Greek maritime aspiration; and the Phœnician worship of that goddess whom the Greeks knew under the name of Aphroditê, became communicated to the latter in Cyprus, in Kythêra, in Sicily—perhaps also in Corinth.

Carthage.

The sixth century B.C., though a period of decline for Tyre and Sidon, was a period of growth for their African colony Carthage, which appears during this century in considerable traffic with the Tyrrhenian towns on the southern coast of Italy, and as thrusting out the Phôkæan settlers from Alalia in Corsica. The wars of the Carthaginians with the Grecian colonies in Sicily, so far as they are known to us, commence shortly after 500 B.C., and continue at intervals, with fluctuating success, for two centuries and a half.

Era of Carthage.

The foundation of Carthage by the Tyrians is placed at different dates, the lowest of which however is 819 B.C.: other authorities place it in 878 B.C., and we have no means of deciding between them. I have already remarked that it is by no means the oldest of the Tyrian colonies. But though Utica and Gadês were more ancient than Carthage,[1] the latter so greatly outstripped them in wealth and power, as to acquire a sort of federal pre-eminence over all the Phœnician colonies on the coast of Africa. In those later times, when the dominion of the Carthaginians had reached its maximum, it comprised the towns of Utica, Hippo, Adrumêtum, and Leptis,—all original Phœnician foundations, and enjoying probably, even as

Dominion of Carthage.

[1] Utica is said to have been founded 287 years earlier than Carthage; the author, who states this, professing to draw his information from Phœnician histories (Aristot. Mirab. Auscult. c. 134). Velleius Paterculus states Gadês to be older than Utica, and places the foundation of Carthage B.C. 819 (i. 2, 6). He seems to follow in the main the same authority as the composer of the Aristotelic compilation above cited. Other statements place the foundation of Carthage in 878 B.C. (Heeren, Ideen über den Verkehr, &c., part ii. b. i p. 29). Appian states the date of the foundation as fifty years before the Trojan war (De Reb. Punic. c. 1); Philistus, as twenty-one years before the same event (Philist. Fragm. 50, ed. Göller); Timæus, as thirty-eight years earlier than the first Olympiad (Timæi Fragm. 21, ed. Didot); Justin, seventy-two years earlier than the foundation of Rome (xviii. 6).

The citation which Josephus gives from Menander's work, extracted from Tyrian ἀναγραφαί, placed the foundation of Carthage 143 years after the building of the temple of Jerusalem (Joseph. cont. Apion. i. c. 17, 18). Apion said that Carthage was founded in the first year of Olympiad 7 (B.C. 748) (Joseph. c. Apion. ii. 2).

dependents of Carthage, a certain qualified autonomy—besides a great number of smaller towns planted by themselves, and inhabited by a mixed population called Liby-Phœnicians. Three hundred such towns—a dependent territory covering half the space between the Lesser and the Greater Syrtis, and in many parts remarkably fertile—a city said to contain 700,000 inhabitants, active, wealthy, and seemingly homogeneous—and foreign dependencies in Sicily, Sardinia, the Balearic isles, and Spain,—all this aggregate of power, under one political management, was sufficient to render the contest of Carthage even with Rome for some time doubtful.

But by what steps the Carthaginians raised themselves to such a pitch of greatness we have no information. We are even left to guess how much of it had already been acquired in the sixth century B.C. As in the case of so many others cities, we have a foundation legend decorating the moment of birth, and then nothing farther. The Tyrian princess Dido or Elisa, daughter of Bêlus, sister of Pygmalion king of Tyre, and wife of the wealthy Sichæus priest of Hêraklês in that city—is said to have been left a widow in consequence of the murder of Sichæus by Pygmalion, who seized the treasures belonging to his victim. But Dido found means to disappoint him of his booty, possessed herself of the gold which had tempted Pygmalion, and secretly emigrated, carrying with her the sacred insignia of Hêraklês. A considerable body of Tyrians followed her. She settled at Carthage on a small hilly peninsula joined by a narrow tongue of land to the continent, purchasing from the natives as much land as could be surrounded by an ox's hide, which she caused to be cut into the thinnest strip, and thus made it sufficient for the site of her first citadel, Byrsa, which afterwards grew up into the great city of Carthage. As soon as her new settlement had acquired footing, she was solicited in marriage by several princes of the native tribes, especially by the Gætulian Jarbas, who threatened war if he were refused. Thus pressed by the clamours of her own people, who desired to come into alliance with the natives, yet irrevocably determined to maintain exclusive fidelity to her first husband, she escaped the conflict by putting an end to her life. She pretended to acquiesce in the proposition of a second marriage, requiring only delay sufficient

Dido.

to offer an expiatory sacrifice to the manes of Sichæus. A vast funeral pile was erected, and many victims slain upon it, in the midst of which Dido pierced her own bosom with a sword and perished in the flames. Such is the legend to which Virgil has given a new colour by interweaving the adventures of Æneas, and thus connecting the foundation legends of Carthage and Rome, careless of his deviation from the received mythical chronology. Dido was worshipped as a goddess at Carthage until the destruction of the city:[1] and it has been imagined with some probability that she is identical with Astartê, the divine patroness under whose auspices the colony was originally established, as Gadês and Tarsus were founded under those of Hêraklês—the tale of the funeral pile and self-burning appearing in the religious ceremonies of other Cilician and Syrian towns.[2] Phœnician religion and worship was diffused along with the Phœnician colonies throughout the larger portion of the Mediterranean.

The Phôkæans of Ionia, who amidst their adventurous voyages westward established the colony of Massalia (as early as 600 B.C.), were only enabled to accomplish this by a naval victory over the Carthaginians—the earliest example of Greek and Carthaginian collision which has been preserved to us. The Carthaginians were jealous of commercial rivalry, and their traffic with the Tuscans and Latins in Italy, as well as their lucrative mine-working in Spain, dates from a period when Greek commerce in those regions was hardly known. In Greek authors the denomination Phœnicians is often used to designate the Carthaginians as well as the inhabitants of Tyre and Sidon, so that we cannot always distinguish which of the two is meant. But it is remarkable that the distant establishment of Gadês, and the numerous settlements planted for commercial purposes along the western coast of Africa and with-

First known collision of Greeks and Carthaginians—Massalia.

[1] "Quamdiu Carthago invicta fuit, pro Deâ culta est." (Justin. xviii. 6; Virgil, Æneid, i. 340—370.) We trace this legend about Dido up to Timæus (Timæi Frag. 23, ed. Didot): Philistus seems to have followed a different story—he said that Carthage had been founded by Azor and Karchêdôn (Philist. Fr. 50). Appian notices both stories (De Reb. Pun. I): that of Dido was current both among the Romans and Carthaginians: of Zôrus (or Ezôrus) and Karchêdôn, the second is evidently of Greek coinage, the first seems genuine Phœnician: see Joseph cont. Apion. i. c. 18—21.

[2] See Movers, Die Phönizier, pp. 609—616.

out the Strait of Gibraltar, are expressly ascribed to the Tyrians.[1] Many of the other Phœnician establishments on the southern coast of Spain seem to have owed their origin to Carthage rather than to Tyre. But the relations between the two, so far as we know them, were constantly amicable, and Carthage even at the period of her highest glory sent Theôri with a tribute of religious recognition to the Tyrian Hêraklês: the visit of these envoys coincided with the siege of the town by Alexander the Great. On that critical occasion, the wives and children of the Tyrians were sent to find shelter at Carthage. Two centuries before, when the Persian empire was in its age of growth and expansion, the Tyrians had refused to aid Kambysês with their fleet in its plans for conquering Carthage, and thus probably preserved their colony from subjugation.[2]

Amicable relations between Tyre and Carthage.

[1] Strabo, xvii. p. 826.

[2] Herodot. iii. 19.

# CHAPTER XXII.

## WESTERN COLONIES OF GREECE—IN EPIRUS, ITALY, SICILY, AND GAUL.

THE stream of Grecian colonisation to the westward, as far as we can be said to know it authentically, with names and dates, begins from the 11th Olympiad. But it is reasonable to believe that there were other attempts earlier than this, though we must content ourselves with recognising them as generally probable. There were doubtless detached bands of volunteer emigrants or marauders who, fixing themselves in some situation favourable to commerce or piracy, either became mingled with the native tribes, or grew up by successive reinforcements into an acknowledged town. Not being able to boast of any filiation from the Prytaneium of a known Grecian city, these adventurers were often disposed to fasten upon the inexhaustible legend of the Trojan war, and ascribe their origin to one of the victorious heroes in the host of Agamemnôn, alike distinguished for their valour and for their ubiquitous dispersion after the siege. Of such alleged settlements by fugitive Grecian or Trojan heroes, there were a great number, on various points throughout the shores of the Mediterranean; and the same honourable origin was claimed even by many non-Hellenic towns.

Early unauthenticated emigration from Greece.

In the eighth century B.C., when this westerly stream of Grecian colonisation begins to assume an authentic shape (735 B.C.), the population of Sicily (as far as our scanty information permits us to determine it) consisted of two races completely distinct from each other—Sikels and Sikans—besides the Elymi (a mixed race apparently distinct from both, occupying

Ante-Hellenic population of Sicily—Sikels—Sikans—Elymi—Phœnicians.

Eryx and Egesta near the westernmost corner of the island) and the Phœnician colonies and coast establishments formed for purposes of trade. According to the belief both of Thucydidês and Philistus, these Sikans, though they gave themselves out as indigenous, were yet of Iberian origin[1] and immigrants of earlier date than the Sikels—by whom they had been invaded and restricted to the smaller western half of the island. The Sikels were said to have crossed over originally from the south-western corner of the Calabrian peninsula, where a portion of the nation still dwelt in the time of Thucydidês. The territory known to Greek writers of the fifth century B.C. by the names of Œnotria on the coast of the Mediterranean, and Italia on that of the Gulfs of Tarentum and Squillace, included all that lies south of a line drawn across the breadth of the country, from the Gulf of Poseidônia (Pæstum) and the river Silarus on the Mediterranean Sea, to the north-west corner of the Gulf of Tarentum. It was bounded northwards by the Iapygians and Messapians, who occupied the Salentine peninsula and the country immediately adjoining to Tarentum, and by the Peuketians on the Ionic Gulf. According to the logographers Pherekydês and Hellanikus,[2] Œnotrus and Peuketius were sons of Lykaôn, grandsons of Pelasgus, and emigrants in very early times from Arcadia to this territory. An important statement in Stephanus Byzantinus[3] acquaints us that the serf-population, whom the great Hellenic cities in this portion of Italy employed in the cultivation of their lands, were called Pelasgi, seemingly even in the historical times. It is upon this name probably that the mythical genealogy of Pherekydês is constructed. This Œnotrian or Pelasgian race were the population whom the Greek colonists found there on their arrival. They were known apparently under other names, such as the Sikels (mentioned even in the Odyssey, though their exact

Œnotria—Italia.

Pelasgi in Italy.

[1] Thucyd. vi. 2; Philistus, Fragm. 3, ed. Göller, ap. Diodôr. v. 6. Timæus adopted the opposite opinion (Diodôr. *l. c.*), also Ephorus, if we may judge by an indistinct passage of Strabo (vi. p. 270). Dionysius of Halikarnassus follows Thucydidês (A. R. i. 22).

The opinion of Philistus is of much value on this point, since he was, or might have been, personally cognizant of Iberian mercenaries in the service of the elder Dionysius.

[2] Pherekyd. Fragm. 85, ed. Didot; Hellanik. Fr. 53, ed. Didot; Dionys. Halik. A. R. i. 11, 13, 22; Skymnus Chius, v. 362; Pausan. viii. 3, 5.

[3] Stephan. Byz. v. Χῖοι.

locality in that poem cannot be ascertained), the Italians or Itali properly so called—the Morgêtes—and the Chaones—all of them names of tribes either cognate or subdivisional.[1] The Chaones or Chaonians are also found not only in Italy, but in Epirus, as one of the most considerable of the Epirotic tribes; while Pandosia, the ancient residence of the Œnotrian kings in the southern corner of Italy,[2] was also the name of a township or locality in Epirus, with a neighbouring river Acherôn in both. From hence, and from some other similarities of name, it has been imagined that Epirots, Œnotrians; Sikels, &c., were all names of cognate people, and all entitled to be comprehended under the generic appellation of Pelasgi. That they belonged to the same ethnical kindred, there seems fair reason to presume; and also that in point of language, manners, and character they were not very widely separated from the ruder branches of the Hellenic race.

It would appear too (as far as any judgment can be formed on a point essentially obscure) that the Œnotrians were ethnically akin to the primitive population of Rome and Latium on one side,[3] as they were to the Epirots on the other; and that tribes of this race, comprising Sikels, and Itali properly so called, as sections, had at one time occupied most of the territory from the left bank of the river Tiber southward between the Apennines and the Mediterranean. Both Herodotus, and his junior contemporary the Syracusan Antiochus, extend Œnotria as far northward as the

Latins—Œnotrians—Epirots—ethnically cognate.

[1] Aristot. Polit. vii. 9, 3. ἔχουν δὲ τὸ πρὸς τὴν Ἰαπυγίαν καὶ τὸν Ἰόνιον Χῶνες (or Χάονες) τὴν καλουμένην Σίριν· ἦσαν δὲ καὶ οἱ Χῶνες Οἰνωτροὶ τὸ γένος.

Antiochus, Fr. 3, 4, 6, 7, ed. Didot; Strabo, vi. p. 254: Hesych. v. Χώνην; Dionys. Hal. A. R. i. 12.

[2] Livy, viii. 24.

[3] For the early habitation of Sikels or Siculi in Latium and Campania, see Dionys. Hal. A. R. i. 1—21: it is curious that Siculi and Sicani, whether the same or different, the primitive ante-Hellenic population of Sicily, are also numbered as the ante-Roman population of Rome: see Virgil, Æneid, viii. 328, and Servius ad Æneid. xi. 317.

The alleged ancient emigration of Evander from Arcadia to Latium forms a parallel to the emigration of Œnôtrus from Arcadia to Southern Italy as recounted by Pherekydês: it seems to have been mentioned even as early as in one of the Hesiodic poems (Servius ad Virg. Æn. viii. 138): compare Steph. Byz. v. Ἡαλλάντιον. The earliest Latin authors appear all to have recognised Evander and his Arcadian emigrants: see Dionys. Hal. i. 31, 32, ii. 9, with his references to Fabius Pictor and Ælius Tubero, i. 79, 80; also Cato ap. Solinum, c. 2. If the old reading Ἀρκάδων, in Thucyd. vi. 2 (which Bekker has now altered into Σικελῶν), be retained, Thucydidês would also stand as witness for a migration from Arcadia into Italy. A third emigration of Pelasgi, from Peloponnêsus to the river Sarnus in Southern Italy (near Pompeii), was mentioned by Conôn (ap. Servium ad Virg. Æn. vii. 730).

river Silarus,[1] and Sophoklês includes the whole coast of the Mediterranean, from the Strait of Messina to the Gulf of Genoa, under the three successive names of Œnotria, the Tyrrhenian Gulf, and Liguria.[2] Before or during the fifth century B.C., however, a different population, called Opicians, Oscans, or Ausonians, had descended from their original seats on or north of the Apennines,[3] and had conquered the territory between Latium and the Silarus, expelling or subjugating the Œnotrian inhabitants, and planting outlying settlements even down to the Strait of Messina and the Liparæan isles. Hence the more precise Thucydidês designates the Campanian territory, in which Cumæ stood, as the country of the Opici; a denomination which Aristotle extends to the river Tiber, so as to comprehend within it Rome and Latium.[4]

[1] Herodotus (i. 24—167) includes Elea (or Velia) in Œnotria—and Tarentum in Italia; while Antiochus considers Tarentum as in Iapygia, and the southern boundary of the Tarentine territory as the northern boundary of Italia: Dionysius of Halikarnassus (A. R. ii. 1) seems to copy from Antiochus when he extends the Œnotrians along the whole south-western corner of Italy, within the line drawn from Tarentum to Poseidonia or Pæstum. Hence the appellation Οἰνωτρίδες νῆσοι to the two islands opposite Elea (Strabo, vi. p. 253). Skymnus Chius (v. 247) recognises the same boundaries.

Twelve Œnotrian cities are cited by name (in Stephanus Byzantinus) from the Εὐρώπη of Hekatæus (Fragm. 30—39, ed. Didot): Skylax in his Periplus does not name Œnotrians; he enumerates Campanians, Samnites, and Lucanians (cap. 9—13). The intimate connexion between Milêtus and Sybaris would enable Hekatæus to inform himself about the interior Œnotrian country.

Œnotria and Italia together (as conceived by Antiochus and Herodotus) comprised what was known a century afterwards as Lucania and Bruttium: see Mannert, Geographie der Griech. und Römer, part ix. b. 9, ch. i. p. 86. Livy, speaking with reference to 317 B.C., when the Lucanian nation as well as the Bruttians were in full vigour, describes only the sea-coast of the lower sea as Grecian—"cum omni orâ Græcorum inferi maris a Thuriis Neapolim et Cumas" (ix. 19). Verrius Flaccus considered the Sikels as *Graeci* (Festus, v. Major Græcia, with Müller's note).

[2] Sophoklês, Triptolem. Fr. 527, ed. Dindorf. He places the lake Avernus, which was close to the Campanian Cumæ, in Tyrrhenia: see Lexicon Sophocleum, ad calc. ed. Brunck, v. Ἄορνος. Euripidês (Medea, 1310—1326) seems to extend Tyrrhenia to the Strait of Messina.

[3] Aristot. Polit. vii. 9, 3. ᾤκουν δὲ τὸ μὲν πρὸς τὴν Τυρρηνίαν Ὀπικοί, καὶ πρότερον καὶ νῦν καλούμενοι τὴν ἐπίκλησιν Αὔσονες. Festus: "*Ausoniam* appellavit Auson, Ulyssis et Calypsûs filius, eam primam partem Italiæ in quâ sunt urbes Beneventum et Cales: deinde paulatim tota quoque Italia quæ Apennino finitur, dicta est Ausonia," &c. The original Ausonia would thus coincide nearly with the territory called Samnium, after the Sabine emigrants had conquered it: see Livy, viii. 16; Strabo, v. p. 250; Virg. Æn. vii. 727, with Servius. Skymnus Chius (v. 227) has copied from the same source as Festus. For the extension of Ausonians along various parts of the more southern coast of Italy, even to Rhegium as well as to the Liparæan isles, see Diodôr. v. 7, 8; Cato. Origg. Fr. lib. iii. ap. Probum ad Virg. Bucol. v. 2. The Pythian priestess, in directing the Chalkidic emigrants to Rhegium, says to them—Ἔνθα πόλιν οἰκίζε, διδοῖ δέ σοι Αὐσονα χώραν (Diodor. Fragm. xiii. p. 11, ap. Scriptt. Vatic. ed. Maii). Temesa is Ausonian in Strabo, vi. p. 255.

[4] Thucyd. vi. 3; Aristot. ap. Dionys. Hal A. R. i. 72. Ἀχαιων τινας τῶν

Not merely Campania, but in earlier times even Latium, originally occupied by a Sikel or Œnotrian population, appears to have been partially overrun and subdued by fiercer tribes from the Apennines, and had thus received a certain intermixture of Oscan race. But in the regions south of Latium, these Oscan conquests were still more overwhelming; and to this cause (in the belief of inquiring Greeks of the fifth century B.C.)[1] were owing the first migrations of the Œnotrian race out of Southern Italy, which wrested the larger portion of Sicily from the pre-existing Sikanians.

This imperfect account, representing the ideas of Greeks of the fifth century B.C. as to the early population of Southern Italy, is borne out by the fullest comparison which can be made between the Greek, Latin, and Oscan languages—the first two certainly, and the third probably, sisters of the same Indo-European family of languages. While the analogy, structural and radical, between Greek and Latin, establishes completely such community of family—and while comparative philology proves that on many points the Latin departs less from the supposed common type and mother-language than the Greek—there exists also in the former a non-Grecian element, and non-Grecian classes of words, which appear to imply a confluence of two or more different people with distinct tongues. The same non-Grecian element, thus traceable in the Latin, seems to present itself still more largely developed in the scanty remains of the Oscan.[2] Moreover the Greek colonies

Analogy of languages—Greek, Latin, and Oscan.

ἀπὸ Τροίης ἀνακομιζομένων—ἐλθεῖν εἰς τὸν τόπον τοῦτον τῆς Ὁπικῆς, ὃς καλεῖται Λάτιον.

Even in the time of Cato the elder, the Greeks comprehended the Romans under the general, and with them contemptuous, designation of Opici (Cato ap. Plin. H. N. xxii. 1: see Antiochus ap. Strab. v. p. 242).

[1] Thucyd. vi. 2. Σικελοὶ δὲ ἐξ Ἰταλίας φεύγοντες Ὀπικοὺς διέβησαν ἐς Σικελίαν (see a Fragment of the geographer Menippus of Pergamus, in Hudson's Geogr. Minor. i. p. 76). Antiochus stated that the Sikels were driven out of Italy into Sicily by the Opicians and Œnotrians; but the Sikels themselves, according to him, were also Œnotrians (Dionys. H. i. 12–22). It is remarkable that Antiochus (who wrote at a time when the name of Rome had not begun to exercise that fascination over men's minds which the Roman power afterwards occasioned), in setting forth the mythical antiquity of the Sikels and Œnotrians, represents the eponymous Sikelus as an exile from Rome, who came into the south of Italy to the king Morgês, successor of Italus—Ἐπεὶ δὲ Ἴταλος κατεγήρα, Μόργης ἐβασίλευσεν. ἐπὶ τούτου δὲ ἀνὴρ ἀφίκετο ἐκ Ῥώμης φυγάς, Σικελὸς ὄνομα αὐτῷ (Antiochus ap. Dionys. H. i. 73: compare c. 12).

Philistus considered Sikelus to be a son of Italus; both he and Hellanikus believed in early migrations from Italy into Sicily, but described the emigrants differently (Philistus, Fragm. 2, ed. Didot).

[2] See the learned observations upon the early languages of Italy and Sicily, which Müller has prefixed to his work

in Italy and Sicily caught several peculiar words from their association with the Sikels, which words approach in most cases very nearly to the Latin—so that a resemblance thus appears between the language of Latium on the one side, and that of Œnotrians and Sikels (in Southern Italy and Sicily) on the other, prior to the establishments of the Greeks. These are the two extremities of the Sikel population; between them appear in the intermediate country the Oscan or Ausonian tribes and language; and these latter seem to have been in a great measure conquerors and intruders from the central mountains. Such analogies of language countenance the supposition of Thucydidês and Antiochus, that these Sikéls had once been spread over a still larger portion of Southern Italy, and had migrated from

on the Etruscans (Einleitung, i. 12). I transcribe the following summary of his views respecting the early Italian dialects and races:—"The notions which we thus obtain respecting the early languages of Italy are as follows: the *Sikel*, a sister language nearly allied to the Greek or Pelasgic; the *Latin*, compounded from the Sikel and from the rougher dialect of the men called *Aborigines;* the *Oscan*, akin to the Latin in both its two elements; the language spoken by the Sabine emigrants in their various conquered territories, *Oscan;* the *Sabine proper*, a distinct and peculiar language, yet nearly connected with the non-Grecian element in Latin and Oscan, as well as with the language of the oldest Ausonians and Aborigines".

[N.B.—This last statement respecting the original Sabine language is very imperfectly made out: it seems equally probable that the Sabellians may have differed from the Oscans no more than the Dorians from the Ionians: see Niebuhr, Röm. Gesch. tom. i. p. 69.]

"Such a comparison of languages presents to us a certain view, which I shall here briefly unfold, of the earliest history of the Italian races. At a period anterior to all records, a single people, akin to the Greeks, dwelling extended from the south of Tuscany down to the Straits of Messina, occupies in the upper part of its territory only the valley of the Tiber—lower down, occupies the mountainous districts also, and in the south, stretches across from sea to sea—called Sikels, Œnotrians, or Peucetians. Other mountain tribes, powerful though not widely extended, live in the northern Abruzzo and its neighbourhood: in the east the Sabines, southward from them the cognate Marsi, more to the west the Aborigines, and among them probably the old Ausonians or Oscans. About 1000 years prior to the Christian æra, there arises among these tribes (from whom almost all the popular migrations in ancient Italy have proceeded) a movement whereby the Aborigines more northward, the Sikels more southward, are precipitated upon the Sikels of the plains beneath. Many thousands of the great Sikel nation withdraw to their brethren the Œnotrians, and by degrees still farther across the Strait to the Island of Sicily. Others of them remain stationary in their residences, and form, in conjunction with the Aborigines, the Latin nation—in conjunction with the Ausonians, the Oscan nation; the latter extends itself over what was afterwards called Samnium and Campania. Still the population and power of these mountain tribes, especially that of the Sabines, goes on perpetually on the increase: as they pressed onward towards the Tiber, at the period when Rome was only a single town, so they also advanced southwards, and conquered first, the mountainous Opica; next, some centuries later, the Opician plain, Campania; lastly, the ancient country of the Œnotrians, afterwards denominated Lucania."

Compare Niebuhr, Römische Geschichte, vol. i. p. 80, 2nd edit., and the first chapter of Mr. Donaldson's Varronianus.

thence into Sicily in consequence of Oscan invasions. The element of affinity existing between Latins, Œnotrians, and Sikels—to a certain degree also between all of them together and the Greeks, but not extending to the Opicians or Oscans, or to the Iapygians—may be called Pelasgic for want of a better name. But by whatever name it be called, the recognition of its existence connects and explains many isolated circumstances in the early history of Rome as well as in that of the Italian and Sicilian Greeks.

Grecian colonisation of ascertained date in Sicily—commences in 735 B.C.

The earliest Grecian colony in Italy or Sicily, of which we know the precise date, is placed about 735 B.C., eighteen years subsequent to the Varronian æra of Rome; so that the causes, tending to subject and hellenise the Sikel population in the southern region, begin their operation nearly at the same time as those which tended gradually to exalt and aggrandise the modified variety of it which existed in Latium. At that time, according to the information given to Thucydidês, the Sikels had been established for three centuries in Sicily. Hellanikus and Philistus—who both recognised a similar migration into that island out of Italy, though they give different names both to the emigrants and to those who expelled them—assign to the migration a date three generations before the Trojan war.[1] Earlier than 735 B.C., however, though we do not know the precise æra of its commencement, there existed one solitary Grecian establishment in the Tyrrhenian Sea—the Campanian Cumæ near Cape Misenum; which the more common opinion of chronologists supposed to have been founded in 1050 B.C., and which has even been carried back by some authors to 1139 B.C.[2] Without reposing any faith in this early chronology, we may at least feel certain that it is the most ancient Grecian establishment in any part of Italy, and that a consider-

Cumæ in Campania—earlier—date unknown.

[1] Thucyd. vi. 2; Philistus, Frag. 2, ed. Didot.

[2] Strabo, v. p. 243; Velleius Paterc. i. 5; Eusebius, p. 121. M. Raoul Rochette, assuming a different computation of the date of the Trojan war, pushes the date of Cumæ still farther back to 1139 B.C. (Histoire des Colonies Grecques, book iv. c. 12, p. 100).

The mythes of Cumæ extended to a period preceding the Chalkidic settlement. See the stories of Aristæus and Dædalus ap. Sallust. Fragment. Incert. p. 264, ed. Delphin.; and Servius ad Virgil. Æneid. vi. 17. The fabulous Thespiadæ, or primitive Greek settlers in Sardinia, were supposed in early ages to have left that island and retired to Cumæ (Diodôr. v. 15)

able time elapsed before any other Greek colonists were bold enough to cut themselves off from the Hellenic world by occupying seats on the other side of the Strait of Messina,[1] with all the hazards of Tyrrhenian piracy as well as of Scylla and Charybdis. The Campanian Cumæ (known almost entirely by this its Latin designation) received its name and a portion of its inhabitants from the Æolic Kymê in Asia Minor. A joint band of settlers, partly from this latter town, partly from Chalkis in Eubœa—the former under the Kymæan Hippoklês, the latter under the Chalkidian Megasthenês—having combined to form the new town, it was settled by agreement that Kymê should bestow the name, and that Chalkis should enjoy the title and honours of the mother-city.[2]

Cumæ, situated on the neck of the peninsula, which terminates in Cape Misenum, occupied a lofty and rocky hill overhanging the sea,[3] and difficult of access on the land side. The unexampled fertility of the Phlegræan plains in the immediate vicinity of the city, the copious supply of fish in the Lucrine lake,[4] and the gold mines in the neighbouring island of Pithekusæ—both subsisted and enriched the colonists. Being joined by fresh settlers from Chalkis, from Eretria, and even from Samos, they became numerous enough to form distinct towns at Dikæarchia and Neapolis, thus spreading over a large portion of the Bay of Naples. In the hollow rock under the very walls of the town was situated the cavern of the prophetic Sibyl—a parallel and reproduction of the Gergithian Sybil near Kymê in Æolis. In the immediate neighbourhood, too, stood the wild woods and dark lake of Avernus, consecrated to the subterranean gods and offering an establishment of priests, with ceremonies evoking the dead for purposes of prophecy or for solving doubts and mysteries. It was here that Grecian imagination localised the Cimmerians and the fable of Odysseus; and the Cumæans derived gains from the numerous visitors to this holy spot,[5] perhaps hardly less than those

[1] Ephorus, Frag. 52, ed. Didot.

[2] Strabo, v. p. 243; Velleius Paterc. i. 5.

[3] See the site of Cumæ as described by Agathias (on occasion of the siege of the place by Narses, in 552 A.D.), Histor. i. 8—10; also by Strabo, v. p. 244.

[4] Diodôr. iv. 21, v. 71; Polyb. iii. 91; Pliny, H. N. iii. 5; Livy, viii. 22. "In Baiano sinu Campaniæ contra Puteolanam civitatem lacus sunt duo, Avernus et Lucrinus: qui olim propter piscium copiam vectigalia magna præstabant" (Servius ad Virg. Georgic. ii. 161).

[5] Strabo, v. p. 243. Καὶ εἰσέπλεόν γε οἱ προθυσόμενοι καὶ ἱλασόμενοι τοὺς

of the inhabitants of Krissa from the vicinity of Delphi. Of the relations of these Cumæans with the Hellenic world generally, we unfortunately know nothing. But they seem to have been in intimate connexion with Rome during the time of the kings, and especially during that of the last king Tarquin ;[1] forming the intermediate link between the Greek and Latin world, whereby the feelings of the Teukrians and Gergithians near the Æolic Kymê, and the legendary stories of Trojan as well as Grecian heroes—Æneas and Odysseus—passed into the antiquarian imagination of Rome and Latium.[2] The writers of the Augustan age knew Cumæ only in its decline, and wondered at the vast extent of its ancient walls, yet remaining in their time. But during the two centuries prior to 500 B.C., these walls enclosed a full and thriving population, in the plenitude of prosperity,—with a surrounding territory extensive as well as fertile,[3] resorted to by purchasers of corn from Rome in years of scarcity, and unassailed as yet by formidable neighbours—and with a coast and harbours well-suited to maritime commerce. At that period the town of Capua (if indeed it existed at all) was of very inferior importance. The chief part of the rich plain around it was included in the possessions of Cumæ :[4] not unworthy probably, in the sixth century B.C., to be numbered with Sybaris and Krotôn.

Prosperity of Cumæ between 700—500 B.C.

The decline of Cumæ begins in the first half of the fifth century B.C. (500—450 B.C.), first from the growth of hostile powers in the interior—the Tuscans and Samnites—next from violent intestine dissensions and a destructive despotism. The town was assailed by a formidable host of invaders

Decline of Cumæ from 500 B.C.

καταχθονίους δαίμονας, ὄντων τῶν ὑφηγουμένων τὰ τοιάδε ἱερέων, ἠργολαβηκότων τὸν τόπον.

[1] Dionys. H. iv. 61, 62 ; vi. 21 ; Livy, ii. 34.

[2] See, respecting the transmission of ideas and fables from the Æolic Kymê to Cumæ in Campania, the first volume of this History, chap. xv.

The father of Hesiod was a native of the Æolic Kymê : we find in the Hesiodic Theogony (*ad fin.*) mention of Latinus as the son of Odysseus and Circê : Servius cites the same from the Ἀσπιδοποιία of Hesiod (Servius ad Virg. Æn. xii. 162 ; compare Cato, Fragment. p. 33, ed. Lion). The great family of the Mamilii at Tusculum also derived their origin from Odysseus and Circê (Livy, i. 49).

The tomb of Elpênôr, the lost companion of Odysseus, was shown at Circeii in the days of Theophrastus (Hist. Plant. v. 8, 3) and Skylax (c. 10).

Hesiod notices the promontory of Pelôrus, the Strait of Messina, and the islet of Ortygia at Syracuse (Diodôr. iv. 85 ; Strabo, i. p. 23).

[3] Livy, ii. 9.

[4] Niebuhr, Röm. Gesch., vol. i. p. 76, 2nd edit.

from the interior, Tuscans reinforced by Umbrian and Daunian allies; which Dionysius refers to the 64th Olympiad (524—520 B.C.), though upon what chronological authority we do not know, and though this same time is marked by Eusebius as the date of the foundation of Dikæarchia from Cumæ. The invaders, in spite of great disparity of number, were bravely repelled by the Cumæans, chiefly through the heroic example of the citizen then first known and distinguished—Aristodêmus Malakus. The government of the city was oligarchical, and the oligarchy from that day became jealous of Aristodêmus; who, on his part, acquired extraordinary popularity and influence among the people. Twenty years afterwards, the Latin city of Aricia, an ancient ally of Cumæ, being attacked by a Tuscan host, entreated succour from the Cumæans. The oligarchy of the latter thought this a good opportunity to rid themselves of Aristodêmus, whom they despatched by sea to Aricia, with rotten vessels and an insufficient body of troops. But their stratagem failed and proved their ruin: for the skill and intrepidity of Aristodêmus sufficed for the rescue of Aricia. He brought back his troops victorious and devoted to himself personally. He then, partly by force, partly by stratagem, subverted the oligarchy, put to death the principal rulers, and constituted himself despot. By a jealous energy, by disarming the people, and by a body of mercenaries, he maintained himself in this authority for twenty years, running his career of lust and iniquity until old age. At length a conspiracy of the oppressed population proved successful against him; he was slain with all his family, and many of his chief partisans, and the former government was restored.[1]

Revolution —despotism of Aristodêmus.

The despotism of Aristodêmus falls during the exile of the expelled Tarquin[2] (to whom he gave shelter) from Rome, and during the government of Gelôn at Syracuse. Such a calamitous period of dissension and misrule was one of the great causes of the decline of Cumæ. Nearly at the same time, the Tuscan power, both by land and sea, appears at its maximum; while the Tuscan establishment at Capua also begins, if we adopt the

Invasion of Cumæ by Tuscans and Samnites from the interior.

[1] The history of Aristodêmus Malakus is given at some length by Dionysius of Halikarnassus (viii. 3—10).

[2] Livy, ii. 21.

æra of the town as given by Cato.[1] There was thus created at the expense of Cumæ a powerful city, which was still farther aggrandised afterwards when conquered and occupied by the Samnites; whose invading tribes, under their own name or that of Lucanians, extended themselves during the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. even to the shores of the Gulf of Tarentum.[2] Cumæ was also exposed to formidable dangers from the sea-side: a fleet either of Tuscans alone, or of Tuscans and Carthaginians united, assailed it in 474 B.C., when it was only rescued by the active interposition of Hiero despot of Syracuse; by whose naval force the invaders were repelled with slaughter.[3] These incidents go partly to indicate, partly to explain, the decline of the most ancient Hellenic settlement in Italy—a decline from which it never recovered.

After briefly sketching the history of Cumæ, we pass naturally to that series of powerful colonies which were established in Sicily and Italy beginning with 735 B.C.—enterprises in which Chalkis, Corinth, Megara, Sparta, the Achæans in Peloponnêsus and the Lokrians out of Peloponnêsus, were all concerned. Chalkis, the metropolis of Cumæ, became also the metropolis of Naxos, the most ancient Grecian colony in Sicily, on the eastern coast of the island, between the Strait of Messina and Mount Ætna.

Rapid multiplication of Grecian colonies in Sicily and Italy, beginning with 735 B.C.

The great number of Grecian settlements, from different colonising towns, which appear to have taken effect within a few years upon the eastern coast of Italy and Sicily—from the Iapygian Cape to Cape Pachynus—leads us to suppose that the extraordinary capacities of the country for receiving new settlers had become known only suddenly. The colonies follow so close upon each other, that the example of the first cannot have been the single determining motive to those which followed. I shall have occasion to point out, even a century later (on the occasion of the settlement of Kyrênê), the narrow range of Grecian navigation; so that the previous supposed ignorance would not be at all incredible, were it not for the fact of the

[1] Velleius Patercul. i. 5.

[2] Compare Strabo, v. p. 250; vi. p. 264. "Cumanos Osca mutavit vicinia," says Velleius, *l. c.*

[3] Diodor. xi. 51; Pindar. Pyth. i. 71.

pre-existing colony of Cumæ. According to the practice universal with Grecian ships — which rarely permitted themselves to lose sight of the coast except in cases of absolute necessity — every man who navigated from Greece to Italy or Sicily first coasted along the shores of Akarnania and Epirus until he reached the latitude of Korkyra; he then struck across first to that island, next to the Iapygian promontory, from whence he proceeded along the eastern coast of Italy (the Gulfs of Tarentum and Squillace) to the southern promontory of Calabria and the Sicilian Strait; he would then sail, still coast-wise, either to Syracuse or to Cumæ, according to his destination. So different are nautical habits now, that this fact requires special notice. We must recollect, moreover, that in 735 B.C., there were yet no Grecian settlements either in Epirus or in Korkyra; outside of the Gulf of Corinth, the world was non-Hellenic, with the single exception of the remote Cumæ. A little before the last-mentioned period, Theoklês (an Athenian or a Chalkidian—probably the latter), being cast by storms on the coast of Sicily, became acquainted with the tempting character of the soil, as well as with the dispersed and half-organised condition of the petty Sikel communities who occupied it.[1] The oligarchy of Chalkis, acting upon the information which he brought back, sent out under his guidance settlers,[2] Chalkidian and Naxian, who founded the Sicilian Naxos. Theoklês and his companions on landing first occupied the eminence of Taurus, immediately overhanging the sea (whereon was established four centuries afterwards the town of Tauromenium, after Naxos had been destroyed by the Syracusan despot Dionysius); for they had to make good their position against the Sikels, who were in occupation of the neighbourhood, and whom it was requisite either to dispossess or to subjugate. After they had acquired secure possession of the territory, the site of the city was transferred to a convenient spot adjoining; but the hill first occupied remained

Foundation of Naxos in Sicily by Theoklês.

Spot where the Greeks first landed in Sicily—memorable afterwards.

[1] Thucyd. vi. 3; Strabo, vi. p. 267.

[2] The admixture of Naxian colonists may be admitted, as well upon the presumption arising from the name, as from the statement of Helianikus, ap. Stephan. Byz. v. Χαλκίς.

Ephorus put together into one the Chalkidian and the Megarian migrations, which Thucydidês represents as distinct (Ephorus ap. Strabo. vi. p. 267).

ever memorable, both to Greeks and to Sikels. On it was erected the altar of Apollo Archêgetês, the divine patron who (through his oracle at Delphi) had sanctioned and determined Hellenic colonisation in the island. The altar remained permanently as a sanctuary, common to all the Sicilian Greeks, where the Theôrs or sacred envoys from their various cities, when they visited the Olympic and other festivals of Greece, were always in the habit of offering sacrifice immediately before their departure. To the indigenous Sikels who maintained their autonomy, on the other hand, the hill was an object of lasting but odious recollection, as the spot in which Grecian conquest and intrusion had first begun; so that at the distance of three centuries and a half from the event, we find them still animated by this sentiment in obstructing the foundation of Tauromenium.[1]

Ante-Hellenic distribution of Sicily.

At the time when Theoclês landed, the Sikels were in possession of the larger half of the island, lying chiefly to the east of the Heræan mountains[2]—a continuous ridge stretching from north-west to south-east, distinct from that chain of detached mountains, much higher, called the Nebrodes, which run nearly parallel with the northern shore. West of the Heræan hills were situated the Sikans; and west of these latter, Eryx and Egesta, the possessions of the Elymi: along the western portion of the northern coast, also, were placed Motyê, Soloeis, and Panormus (now Palermo), the Phœnician or Carthaginian seaports. The formation (or at least the extension) of these three last-mentioned ports, however, was a consequence of the multiplied Grecian colonies; for the Phœnicians down to this time had not founded any territorial or permanent establishments, but had contented themselves with occupying in a temporary way various capes or circumjacent islets, for the purpose of trade with the interior. The arrival of formidable Greek settlers, maritime like themselves, induced them to abandon these outlying factories, and to concentrate their strength in the three considerable towns above-

[1] Thucyd. vi. 3; Diodôr. xiv. 59—88.

[2] Mannert places the boundary of Sikels and Sikans at these mountains: Otto Siefert (Akragas und sein Gebiet, Hamburg, 1846, p. 53) places it at the Gemelli Colles, rather more to the westward—thus contracting the domain of the Sikans: compare Diodôr. iv. 82—83.

named, all near to that corner of the island which approached most closely to Carthage. The east side of Sicily, and most part of the south, were left open to the Greeks, with no other opposition than that of the indigenous Sikels and Sikans, who were gradually expelled from all contact with the sea-shore, except on part of the north side of the island—and who were indeed so unpractised at sea, as well as destitute of shipping, that in the tale of their old migration out of Italy into Sicily, the Sikels were affirmed to have crossed the narrow strait upon rafts at a moment of favourable wind.[1]

In the very next year[2] to the foundation of Naxos, Corinth began her part in the colonisation of the island. A body of settlers, under the Œkist Archias, landed in the islet Ortygia, farther southward on the eastern coast, expelled the Sikel occupants, and laid the first stone of the mighty Syracuse. Ortygia, two English miles in circumference, was separated from the main island only by a narrow channel, which was bridged over when the city was occupied and enlarged by Gelôn in the 72nd Olympiad, if not earlier. It formed only a small part, though the most secure and best-fortified part, of the vast space which the city afterwards occupied. But it sufficed alone for the inhabitants during a considerable time, and the present city in its modern decline has again reverted to the same modest limits. Moreover Ortygia offered another advantage of not less value. It lay across the entrance of a spacious harbour, approached by a narrow mouth, and its fountain of Arethusa was memorable in antiquity both for abundance and goodness of water. We should have been glad to learn something respecting the numbers, character, position, nativity, &c., of these primitive emigrants, the founders of a city afterwards comprising a vast walled circuit, which Strabo reckons at 180 stadia, but which the modern observations of Colonel Leake announce as fourteen English miles,[3] or about 122 stadia. We are told only that many of them came from the Corinthian village of Tenea, and that one of them sold to a

B.C. 734.

Foundation of Syracuse.

[1] Thucyd. vi. 2.

[2] Mr. Fynes Clinton discusses the æra of Syracuse, Fasti Hellenici, ad B.C. 734, and the same work vol. ii. Appendix xi. p. 264.

[3] See Colonel Leake, notes on the Topography of Syracuse, p. 41.

comrade on the voyage his lot of land in prospective, for the price of a honey-cake. The little which we hear about the determining motives[1] of the colony refers to the personal character of the œkist. Archias son of Euagêtus, one of the governing gens of the Bacchiadæ at Corinth, in the violent prosecution of unbridled lust, had caused, though unintentionally, the death of a free youth named Aktæôn; whose father Melissus, after having vainly endeavoured to procure redress, slew himself at the Isthmian games, invoking the vengeance of Poseidôn against the aggressor.[2] Such were the destructive effects of this paternal curse, that Archias was compelled to expatriate. The Bacchiadæ placed him at the head of the emigrants to Ortygia, in 734 B.C.: at that time, probably, this was a sentence of banishment to which no man of commanding station would submit except under the pressure of necessity.

There yet remained room for new settlements between Naxos and Syracuse; and Theoklês, the œkist of Naxos, found himself in a situation to occupy part of this space only five years after the foundation of Syracuse: perhaps he may have been joined by fresh settlers. He attacked and expelled the Sikels[3] from the fertile spot called Leontini, seemingly about half-way down on the eastern coast between Mount Ætna and Syracuse; and also from Katana, immediately adjoining to Mount Ætna, which still retains both its name and its importance. Two new Chalkidic colonies were thus founded — Theoklês himself becoming œkist of Leontini, and Euarchus, chosen by the Katanæan settlers themselves, of Katana. Leontini and Katana.

The city of Megara was not behind Corinth and Chalkis in furnishing emigrants to Sicily. Lamis the Megarian, having now arrived with a body of colonists, took possession first of a new spot called Trotilus, but afterwards joined the recent Chalkidian settlement at Leontini. The two bodies of settlers, however, not living in harmony, Lamis, with his companions, was soon expelled; he then occupied Thapsus,[4] Megarian Sicily.

[1] Athenæ. iv. 167; Strabo, ix. p. 380.
[2] Diodôr. Frag. Lit. viii. p. 24; Plutarch, Narrat. Amator. p. 772; Schol. Apollon. Rhod. iv. 1212.
[3] Polyænus (v. 5, 1) describes the stratagem of Theoklês on this occasion.
[4] Polyænus details a treacherous stratagem whereby this expulsion is said to have been accomplished (v. 5, 2).

at a little distance to the northward of Ortygia or Syracuse, and shortly afterwards died. His followers made an alliance with Hyblôn, king of a neighbouring tribe of Sikels, who invited them to settle in his territory. They accepted the proposition, relinquished Thapsus, and founded, in conjunction with Hyblôn, the city called the Hyblæan Megara, between Leontini and Syracuse. This incident is the more worthy of notice, because it is one of the instances which we find of a Grecian colony beginning by amicable fusion with the pre-existing residents: Thucydidês seems to conceive the prince Hyblôn as betraying his people against their wishes to the Greeks.[1]

It was thus that, during the space of five years, several distinct bodies of Greek emigrants had rapidly succeeded each other in Sicily. For the next forty years, we do not hear of any fresh arrivals, which is the more easy to understand as there were during that interval several considerable foundations on the coast of Italy, which probably took off the disposable Greek settlers.

Gela. At length, forty-five years after the foundation of Syracuse, a fresh body of settlers arrived; partly from Rhodes under Antiphêmus, partly from Krête under Entimus. They founded the city of Gela on the south-western front of the island, between Cape Pachynus and Lilybæum (B.C. 690)—still on the territory of the Sikels, though extending ultimately to a portion of that of the Sikans.[2] The name of the city was given from that of the neighbouring river Gela.

One other fresh migration from Greece to Sicily remains to be mentioned, though we cannot assign the exact date of it. The

Zanklê, afterwards Messênê (Messina). town of Zanklê (now Messina), on the strait between Italy and Sicily, was at first occupied by certain privateers or pirates from Cumæ—the situation being eminently convenient for their operations. But the success of the other Chalkidic settlements imparted to this nest of pirates a more enlarged and honourable character. A body of new settlers joined them from Chalkis and other towns of Eubœa, the land was regularly divided, and two joint œkists were provided to qualify the town as a member of the Hellenic communion—

[1] Thucyd. vi. 3. Ὕβλωνος τοῦ βασιλέως προδόντος τὴν χώραν καὶ καθηγησαμένου.

[2] Thucyd. vi. 4; Diodôr. Excerpt. Vatican. ed. Maii, Fragm. xiii. p. 13; Pausanias, viii. 46, 2.

Periêrês from Chalkis, and Kratæmenês from Cumæ. The name Zanklê had been given by the primitive Sikel occupants of the place, meaning in their language *a sickle;* but it was afterwards changed to Messênê by Anaxilis despot of Rhegium, who, when he conquered the town, introduced new inhabitants in a manner hereafter to be noticed.[1]

Sub-colonies—Akræ, Kasmenæ, Kamarina, &c.

Besides these emigrations direct from Greece, the Hellenic colonies in Sicily became themselves the founders of sub-colonies. Thus the Syracusans, seventy years after their own settlement (B.C. 664), founded Akræ— Kasmenæ, twenty years afterwards (B.C. 644), and Kamarina forty-five years after Kasmenæ (B.C. 599): Daskôn and Menekôlus were the œkists of the latter, which became in process of time an independent and considerable town, while Akræ and Kasmenæ seem to have remained subject to Syracuse. Kamarina was on the south-western side of the island, forming the boundary of the Syracusan territory towards Gela. Kallipolis was established from Naxos, and Eubœa (a town so called) from Leontini.[2]

Agrigentum, Selinûs, Himera, &c.

Hitherto the Greeks had colonised altogether on the territory of the Sikels. But the three towns which remain to be mentioned were all founded in that of the Sikans[3] —Agrigentum or Akragas—Selinûs—and Himera. The two former were both on the south-western coast—Agrigentum bordering upon Gela on the one side and upon Selinûs on the other. Himera was situated on the westerly portion of the northern coast—the single Hellenic establishment, in the time of Thucydidês, which that long line of coast presented. The inhabitants of the Hyblæan Megara were founders of Selinûs, about 630 B.C., a century after their own establishment. The œkist Pamillus, according to the usual Hellenic practice, was invited from their metropolis Megara in Greece Proper, but we are not told how many fresh settlers came with him: the language of Thucydidês leads us to suppose that the new town was peopled chiefly from the Hyblæan Megarians themselves. The town of

[1] Thucyd. vi. 4.

[2] Strabo, vi. p. 272.

[3] Stephanus Byz. Σικανία, ἡ περίχωρος Ἀκραγαντινῶν Diodor. iv. 78. Herodot. vii. 170; Vessa, the most considerable among the Sikanian townships or villages, with its prince Teutus, is said to have been conquered by Phalaris despot of Agrigentum, through a mixture of craft and force (Polyæn. v. 1, 4).

Akragas or Agrigentum, called after the neighbouring river of the former name, was founded from Gela in B.C. 582. Its œkists were Aristonous and Pystilus, and it received the statutes and religious characteristics of Gela. Himera, on the other hand, was founded from Zanklê, under three œkists, Eukleidês, Simus, and Sakôn. The chief part of its inhabitants were of Chalkidic race, and its legal and religious characteristics were Chalkidic. But a portion of the settlers were Syracusan exiles, called Mylêtidæ, who had been expelled from home by a sedition, so that the Himeræan dialect was a mixture of Doric and Chalkidic. Himera was situated not far from the towns of the Elymi—Eryx and Egesta.

Such were the chief establishments founded by the Greeks in Sicily during the two centuries after their first settlement in 735 B.C. The few particulars just stated respecting them are worthy of all confidence—for they come to us from Thucydidês—but they are unfortunately too few to afford the least satisfaction to our curiosity. It cannot be doubted that these first two centuries were periods of steady increase and prosperity among the Sicilian Greeks, undisturbed by those distractions and calamities which supervened afterwards, and which led indeed to the extraordinary aggrandisement of some of their communities, but also to the ruin of several others. Moreover it seems that the Carthaginians in Sicily gave them no trouble until the time of Gelôn. Their position will indeed seem singularly advantageous, if we consider the extraordinary fertility of the soil in this fine island, especially near the sea—its capacity for corn, wine, and oil, the species of cultivation to which the Greek husbandman had been accustomed under less favourable circumstances—its abundant fisheries on the coast, so important in Grecian diet, and continuing undiminished even at the present day—together with sheep, cattle, hides, wool, and timber from the native population in the interior. These natives seem to have been of rude pastoral habits, dispersed either among petty hill-villages, or in caverns hewn out of the rock, like the primitive inhabitants of the Balearic islands and Sardinia; so that Sicily, like New Zealand in our century, was now for the first time approached by organised industry and tillage.[1] Their

Prosperity of the Sicilian Greeks.

[1] Of these Sikel or Sikan caverns many traces yet remain: see Otto Siefert, Akragas und sein Gebiet, pp. 39, 45, 49, 55, and the work of Captain

progress, though very great, during this most prosperous interval (between the foundation of Naxos in 735 B.C. to the reign of Gelôn at Syracuse in 485 B.C.), is not to be compared to that of the English colonies in America; but it was nevertheless very great, and appears greater from being concentrated as it was in and around a few cities. Individual spreading and separation of residence were rare, nor did they consist either with the security or the social feelings of a Grecian colonist. The city to which he belonged was the central point of his existence, where the produce which he raised was brought home to be stored or sold, and where alone his active life, political, domestic, religious, recreative, &c., was carried on. There were dispersed throughout the territory of the city small fortified places and garrisons,[1] serving as temporary protection to the cultivators in case of sudden inroad; but there was no permanent residence for the free citizen except the town itself. This was, perhaps, even more the case in a colonial settlement, where everything began and spread from one central point, than in Attica, where the separate villages had once nourished a population politically independent. It was in the town, therefore, that the aggregate increase of the colony palpably concentrated itself—property as well as population—private comfort and luxury not less than public force and grandeur. Such growth and improvement was of course sustained by the cultivation of the territory, but the evidences of it were most manifest in the town. The large population which we shall have

W. H. Smyth—Sicily and its Islands, London, 1824, p. 190.

"These cryptæ (observes the latter) appear to have been the earliest effort of a primitive and pastoral people towards a town, and are generally without regularity as to shape and magnitude: in after-ages they perhaps served as a retreat in time of danger, and as a place of security, in case of extraordinary alarm, for women, children, and valuables. In this light, I was particularly struck with the resemblance these rude habitations bore to the caves I had seen in Owhyhee, for similar uses. The Troglodyte villages of Northern Africa, of which I saw several, are also precisely the same.

"The rock caves of Sicily are remarkable. The southern walls of Agrigentum are formed of a continued line of rocks which supported the town. In the inside of this natural wall are excavated the tombs of (probably) the principal citizens. The very interesting ruins of little Akræ, high up in the Herræan range, nestle under a cliff in which numbers of tombs are excavated. The Necropolis of Syracuse, between Achradina and the Great Harbour, is composed of similar rock excavations: and there are subterraneous galleries or catacombs also high up in Epipolæ."

About the early cave-residences in Sardinia and the Balearic islands consult Diodôr. v. 15—17.

[1] Thucydid. vi. 45. *τὰ περιπόλια τὰ ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ* (of Syracuse).

occasion to notice as belonging to Agrigentum, Sybaris, and other cities will illustrate this position.

Mixed character of the population.

There is another point of some importance to mention in regard to the Sicilian and Italian cities. The population of the town itself may have been principally, though not wholly, Greek; but the population of the territory belonging to the town, or of the dependent villages which covered it, must have been in a great measure Sikel or Sikan. The proof of this is found in a circumstance common to all the Sicilian and Italian Greeks—the peculiarity of their weights,

Peculiarity of the monetary and statical system among the Sicilian and Italian Greeks.

measures, monetary system, and language. The pound and ounce are divisions and denominations belonging altogether to Italy and Sicily, and unknown originally to the Greeks, whose scale consisted of the obolus, the drachma, the mina, and the talent. Among the Greeks, too, the metal first and most commonly employed for money was silver, while in Italy and Sicily copper was the primitive metal made use of. Now among all the Italian and Sicilian Greeks a scale of weight and money arose quite different from that of the Greeks at home, formed by a combination and adjustment of the one of these systems to the other. It is in many points complex and difficult to understand, but in the final result the native system seems to be predominant, and the Grecian system subordinate.[1] Such a consequence as this could not have ensued, if the Greek settlers in Italy and Sicily had kept themselves apart as communities, and had merely carried on commerce and barter with communities of Sikels. It implies a fusion of the two races in the same

[1] Respecting the statical and monetary system, prevalent among the Italian and Sicilian Greeks, see Aristot. Fragment. περὶ Πολιτειῶν, ed. Neumann, p. 102; Pollux, iv. 174, ix. 80—87; and above all, Boeckh, Metrologie, ch. xviii. p. 292, and the abstract and review of that work in the Classical Museum, No. 1; also O. Müller, Die Etrusker, vol. i. p. 309.

The Sicilian Greeks reckoned by talents, each consisting of 120 litræ or libræ: the Æginæan obolus was the equivalent of the litra, having been the value in silver of a pound weight of copper, at the time when the valuation was taken.

The common denominations of money and weight (with the exception of the talent, the meaning of which was altered while the word was retained) seem to have been all borrowed by the Italian and Sicilian Greeks from the Sikel or Italic scale, not from the Grecian—νούμμος, λίτρα, δεκάλιτρον, πεντηκοντάλιτρον, πεντούγκιον, ἑξᾶς, τετρᾶς, τριᾶς, ἥμινα, ἡμιλίτριον (see Fragments of Epicharmus and Sophrôn, ap. Ahrens de Dialecto Dorica, Appendix, pp. 435, 471, 472, and Athenæ. xi. p. 479).

community, though doubtless in the relation of superior and subject, and not in that of equals. The Greeks on arriving in the island expelled the natives from the town, perhaps also from the lands immediately round the town. But when they gradually extended their territory, this was probably accomplished, not by the expulsion, but by the subjugation, of those Sikel tribes, whose villages, much subdivided and each individually petty, their aggressions successively touched.

At the time when Theoklês landed on the hill near Naxos, and Archias in the islet of Ortygia, and when each of them expelled the Sikels from that particular spot, there were Sikel villages or little communities spread through all the neighbouring country. By the gradual encroachments of the colony, some of these might be dispossessed and driven out of the plains near the coast into the more mountainous regions of the interior. But many of them doubtless found it convenient to submit, to surrender a portion of their lands, and to hold the rest as subordinate villagers of an Hellenic city community.[1] We find even at the time of the Athenian invasion (414 B.C.) villages existing in distinct identity as Sikels, yet subject and tributary to Syracuse.

Sikels and Sikans gradually hellenised.

Moreover the influence which the Greeks exercised, though in the first instance essentially compulsory, became also in part self-operating—the ascendency of a higher over a lower civilization. It was the working of concentrated townsmen, safe among one another by their walls and by mutual confidence, and surrounded by more or less of ornament, public as well as private—upon dispersed, unprotected, artless villagers, who could not be insensible to the charm of that superior intellect, imagination, and organisation, which wrought so powerfully upon the whole contemporaneous world. To understand the action of these superior immigrants upon the native but inferior Sikels, during those three earliest centuries (730—430 B.C.) which followed the arrival of Archias and Theoklês, we have only to study the continuance of the same action during the three succeeding centuries which preceded the age of Cicero. At the period when Athens undertook the

[1] Thucyd. vi. 88.

siege of Syracuse (B.C. 415), the interior of the island was occupied by Sikel and Sikan communities, autonomous and retaining their native customs and language.[1] But in the time of Verres and Cicero (three centuries and a half afterwards) the interior of the island as well as the maritime regions had become hellenised: the towns in the interior were then hardly less Greek than those on the coast. Cicero contrasts favourably the character of the Sicilians with that of the Greeks generally (*i. e.* the Greeks out of Sicily), but he nowhere distinguishes Greeks in Sicily from native Sikels;[2] nor Enna and Centuripi from Katana and Agrigentum. The little Sikel villages became gradually semi-hellenised and merged into subjects of a Grecian town: during the first three centuries, this change took place in the regions of the coast—during the following three centuries, in the regions of the interior; and probably with greater rapidity and effect in the earlier period, not only because the action of the Grecian communities was then closer, more concentrated, and compulsory, but because also the obstinate tribes could then retire into the interior.

Difference between the Greeks in Sicily and those in Greece Proper.

The Greeks in Sicily are thus not to be considered as purely Greeks, but as modified by a mixture of Sikel and Sikan language, customs, and character. Each town included in its non-privileged population a number of semi-hellenised Sikels (or Sikans, as the case might be), who, though in a state of dependence, contributed to mix the breed and influence the entire mass. We have no reason to suppose that the Sikel or Œnotrian language ever became written, like Latin, Oscan, or Umbrian.[3] The inscrip-

[1] Thucyd. 62—87; vii. 13.

[2] Cicero in Verrem, Act. ii. lib. iv. c. 26—51; Diodôr. v. 6.

Contrast the manner in which Cicero speaks of Agyrium, Centuripi, and Enna, with the description of these places as inhabited by autonomous Sikels, B.C. 396, in the wars of the elder Dionysius (Diodôr. xiv. 55, 58, 78). Both Sikans and Sikels were at that time completely distinguished from the Greeks, in the centre of the island.

O. Müller states that "Syracuse seventy years after its foundation colonised Akræ, also Enna, situated in the centre of the island" (Hist. of Dorians, i. 6, 7). Enna is mentioned by Stephanus Byz. as a Syracusan foundation, but without notice of the date of its foundation, which must have been much later than Müller here affirms. Serra di Falco (Antichità di Sicilia, Introd. t. i. p. 9) gives Enna as having been founded later than Akræ, but earlier than Kasmenæ; for which date I find no authority. Talaria (see Steph. Byz. *ad voc.*) is also mentioned as another Syracusan city, of which we do not know either the date or the particulars of foundation.

[3] Ahrens, De Dialecto Dorica, sect. i. p. 3.

tions of Segesta and Halesus are all in Doric Greek, which supplanted the native tongue for public purposes as a separate language, but not without becoming itself modified in the confluence. In following the ever-renewed succession of violent political changes, the inferior capacity of regulated and pacific popular government, and the more unrestrained voluptuous licence—which the Sicilian and Italian Greeks[1] exhibit as compared with Athens and the cities of Greece Proper—we must call to mind that we are not dealing with pure Hellenism; and that the native element, though not unfavourable to activity or increase of wealth, prevented the Grecian colonists from partaking fully in that improved organisation which we so distinctly trace in Athens from Solôn downwards. How much the taste, habits, ideas, religion, and local mythes of the native Sikels passed into the minds of the Sikeliots or Sicilian Greeks, is shown by the character of their literature and poetry. Sicily was the native country of that rustic mirth and village buffoonery which gave birth to the primitive comedy—politicised and altered at Athens so as to suit men of the market-place, the ekklesia, and the dikastery—blending in the comedies of the Syracusan Epicharmus copious details about the indulgences of the table (for which the ancient Sicilians were renowned) with Pythagorean philosophy and moral maxims—but given with all the naked simplicity of common life, in a sort of rhythmical prose without even the restraint of a fixed metre, by the Syracusan Sophrôn in his lost Mimes, and afterwards polished as well as idealised in the Bucolic poetry of Theokritus.[2] That which is commonly

[1] Plato, Epistol. vii. p. 326; Plautus, Rudens, Act. i. Sc. i. 56; Act. ii. Sc. vi. 58.

[2] Timokreon, Fragment. 5, ap. Ahrens, De Dialecto Dorică, p. 478—Σικελὸς κομῳὸς ἀνὴρ Ποτὶ τὰν ματέρ' ἔφα.

Bernhardy, Grundriss der Geschichte der Griech. Litteratur, vol. ii. ch. 120, sect. 2—5; Grysar, De Doriensium Comœdia (Cologne, 1828), ch. i. pp. 41, 55, 57, 210; Boeckh, De Græcæ Tragœd. Princip. p. 52; Aristot. ap. Athenæ. xi. 505. The κόνταβος seems to have been a native Sikel fashion, borrowed by the Greeks (Athenæus, xv. pp. 666—668).

The Sicilian βουκολιασμός was a fashion among the Sicilian herdsmen earlier than Epicharmus, who noticed the alleged inventor of it, Diomus, the βούκολος Σικελιώτης (Athenæ. xiv. p. 619). The rustic manners and speech represented in the Sicilian comedy are contrasted with the town manners and speech of the Attic comedy by Plautus, Persæ, Act. iii. Sc. i. v. 31:—

"Librorum eccillum habeo plenum soracum.
Dabuntur dotis tibi inde sexcenti logi.
Atque Attici omnes, nullum Siculum acceperis".

Compare the beginning of the prologue to the Menæchmi of Plautus.

The comic μυθος began at Syracuse with Epicharmus and Phormis (Aristot. Poet. v. 5).

termed the Doric comedy was, in great part at least, the Sikel comedy taken up by Dorian composers—the Doric race and dialect being decidedly predominant in Sicily. The manners thus dramatised belonged to that coarser vein of humour which the Doric Greeks of the town had in common with the semi-hellenised Sikels of the circumjacent villages. Moreover it seems probable that this rustic population enabled the despots of the Greco-Sicilian towns to form easily and cheaply those bodies of mercenary troops, by whom their power was sustained,[1] and whose presence rendered the continuance of popular government, even supposing it begun, all but impossible.

Native population in Sicily not numerous enough to become formidable to the Greek settlers.

It was the destiny of most of the Grecian colonial establishments to perish by the growth and aggression of those inland powers upon whose coast they were planted; powers which gradually acquired, from the vicinity of the Greeks, a military and political organisation, and a power of concentrated action, such as they had not originally possessed. But in Sicily the Sikels were not numerous enough even to maintain permanently their own nationality, and were ultimately penetrated on all sides by Hellenic ascendency and manners. We shall nevertheless come to one remarkable attempt, made by a native Sikel prince in the 82nd Olympiad (455 B.C.)—the enterprising Duketius—to group many Sikel petty villages into one considerable town, and thus to raise his countrymen into the Grecian stage of polity and organisation. Had there been any Sikel prince endowed with these superior ideas at the time when the Greeks first settled in Sicily, the subsequent history of the island would probably have been very different. But Duketius had derived his projects from the spectacle of the Grecian towns around him, and these latter had acquired much too great power to permit him to succeed. The description of his abortive attempt, however, which we find in Diodôrus,[2] meagre as it is, forms an interesting point in the history of the island.

Sikel prince Duketius.

Grecian colonisation in Italy began nearly at the same time as in Sicily, and was marked by the same general circumstances.

1 Zenobius, Proverb. v 84—Σικελὸς στρατιώτης. 2 Diodôr. xi. 90, 91; xii. 9.

Placing ourselves at Rhegium (now Reggio) on the Sicilian strait, we trace Greek cities gradually planted on various points of the coast as far as Cumæ on the one sea and Tarentum (Taranto) on the other. Between the two seas runs the lofty chain of the Apennines, calcareous in the upper part of its course, throughout Middle Italy—granitic and schistose in the lower part, where it traverses the territories now called the Hither and the Farther Calabria. The plains and valleys on each side of the Calabrian Apennines exhibit a luxuriance of vegetation extolled by all observers, and surpassing even that of Sicily ;[1] and great as the productive powers of this territory are now, there is full reason for believing that they must have been far greater in ancient times. For it has been visited by repeated earthquakes, each of which has left calamitous marks of devastation. Those of 1638 and 1783 (especially the latter, whose destructive effects were on a terrific scale both as to life and property[2]) are of a date sufficiently recent to admit of recording and measuring the damage done by each ; and that damage, in many parts of the south-western coast, was great and irreparable. Animated as the epithets are, therefore, with which the modern traveller paints the present fertility of Calabria, we are warranted in enlarging their meaning when we conceive the country as it stood between 720—320 B.C., the period of Grecian occupation and independence ; while the unhealthy air, which now desolates the plains generally, seems then to have been felt only to a limited extent, and over particular localities. The founders of Tarentum,

Grecian colonies in Southern Italy.

Native population and territory.

[1] See Dolomieu, Dissertation on the Earthquakes of Calabria Ultra in 1783, in Pinkerton, Collection of Voyages and Travels, vol. v. p. 280.

"It is impossible (he observes) to form an adequate idea of the fertility of Calabria Ultra, particularly of that part called the plain (south-west of the Apennines below the Gulf of St. Eufemia). The fields, productive of olive-trees of larger growth than any seen elsewhere, are yet productive of grain. Vines load with their branches the trees on which they grow, yet lessen not their crops. All things grow there, and nature seems to anticipate the wishes of the husbandman. There is never a sufficiency of hands to gather the whole of the olives, which finally fall and rot at the bottom of the trees that bore them, in the months of February and March. Crowds of foreigners, principally Sicilians, come there to help to gather them, and share the produce with the grower. Oil is their chief article of exportation: in every quarter their wines are good and precious." Compare pp. 278—282.

[2] Mr. Keppel Craven observes (Tour through the Southern Provinces of Naples, ch. xiii. p. 254), "The earthquake of 1783 may be said to have altered the face of the whole of Calabria Ultra, and extended its ravages as far northward as Cosenza"

Sybaris, Krotôn, Lokri, and Rhegium planted themselves in situations of unexampled promise to the industrious cultivator, which the previous inhabitants had turned to little account; though since the subjugation of the Grecian cities, these once rich possessions have sunk into poverty and depopulation, especially the last three centuries, from insalubrity, indolence, bad administration, and fear of the Barbary corsairs.

The Œnotrians, Sikels, or Italians, who were in possession of these territories in 720 B.C., seem to have been rude petty communities—procuring for themselves safety by residence on lofty eminences—more pastoral than agricultural, and some of them consuming the produce of their fields in common mess, on a principle analogous to the syssitia of Sparta or Krête. King Italus was said to have introduced this peculiarity[1] among the southernmost portion of the Œnotrian population, and at the same time to have bestowed upon them the name of Italians, though they were also known by the name of Sikels. Throughout the centre of Calabria between sea and sea, the high chain of the Apennines afforded protection to a certain extent both to their independence and to their pastoral habits. But these heights are made to be enjoyed in conjunction with the plains beneath, so as to alternate winter and summer pasture for the cattle. It is in this manner that the richness of the country is rendered available, since a large portion of the mountain range is buried in snow during the winter months. Such remarkable diversity of soil and climate rendered Calabria a land of promise for Grecian settlement. The plains and lower eminences were as productive in corn, wine, oil, and flax as the mountains in summer pasture and timber; and abundance of rain falls upon the higher ground, which requires only industry and care to be made to impart the maximum of fertility to the lower. Moreover a long line of sea-coast (though not well furnished with harbours) and an abundant supply of fish came in aid of the advantages of the soil. While the poorer freemen of the Grecian cities were enabled to obtain small lots of fertile land in the neighbourhood, to be cultivated by their own hands, and to provide for the most part their own food and clothing, the

[1] Aristot. Polit. vii. 9, 3.

richer proprietors made profitable use of the more distant portions of the territory by means of their cattle, sheep, and slaves.

Of the Grecian towns on this favoured coast, the earliest as well as the most prosperous were Sybaris and Krotôn: both in the Gulf of Tarentum—both of Achæan origin—and conterminous with each other in respect of territory. Krotôn was placed not far to the west of the south-eastern extremity of the Gulf, called in ancient times the Lakinian cape, and ennobled by the temple of the Lakinian Hêrê, which became alike venerated and adorned by the Greek resident as well as by the passing navigator. One solitary column of the temple, the humble remnant of its past magnificence, yet marks the extremity of this once-celebrated promontory. Sybaris seems to have been planted in the year 720 B.C., Krotôn in 710 B.C.: Iselikeus was œkist of the former,[1] Myskellus of the latter. This large Achæan emigration seems to have been connected with the previous expulsion of the Achæan population from the more southerly region of Peloponnêsus by the Dorians, though in what precise manner we are not enabled to see. The Achæan towns in Peloponnêsus appear in later times too inconsiderable to furnish emigrants, but probably in the eighth century B.C. their population may have been larger. The town of Sybaris was planted between two rivers, the Sybaris and the Krathis[2] (the name of the latter borrowed from a river of Achaia); the town of Krotôn, about twenty-five miles distant, on the river Æsarus. The primitive settlers of Sybaris consisted in part of Trœzenians, who were however subsequently expelled by the more numerous Achæans—a deed of violence which was construed by the religious sentiment of Antiochus and some other Grecian historians, as having drawn down upon them the anger of the gods in the ultimate destruction of the city by the Krotoniates.[3]

Sybaris and Krotôn.

[1] Strabo, vi. p. 263. Kramer in his new edition of Strabo follows Koray in suspecting the correctness of the name Ἰσελικεύς, which certainly departs from the usual analogy of Grecian names. Assuming it to be incorrect, however, there are no means of rectifying it: Kramer prints—οἰκιστὴς δὲ αὐτῆς ὁ Ἴσ . . . . . Ἑλικεύς: thus making Ἑλικεύς the ethnicon of the Achæan town Helikê.

There were also legends which connected the foundation of Krotôn with Hêraklês, who was affirmed to have been hospitably sheltered by the eponymous hero Krotôn. Hêraklês was οἰκεῖος at Krotôn: see Ovid, Metamorph. xv. 1—60; Jamblichus, Vit. Pythagor. c. 8, p. 30, c. 9, p. 37, ed. Küster.

[2] Herodot. i. 145.

[3] Aristot. Polit. v. 2, 10.

The fatal contest between these two cities, which ended in the ruin of Sybaris, took place in 510 B.C., after the latter had subsisted in growing prosperity for 210 years. And the astonishing prosperity to which both of them attained is a sufficient proof that during most of this period they had remained in peace at least, if not in alliance and common Achæan brotherhood. Unfortunately, the general fact of their great size, wealth, and power is all that we are permitted to know. The walls of Sybaris embraced a circuit of fifty stadia, or near six miles, while those of Krotôn were even larger, comprising little less than twelve miles.[1] A large walled circuit was advantageous for sheltering the moveable property in the territory around, which was carried in on the arrival of an invading enemy. Both cities possessed an extensive dominion across the Calabrian peninsula from sea to sea. But the territorial range of Sybaris seems to have been greater and her colonies wider and more distant—a fact which may perhaps explain the smaller circuit of the city.

Territory and colonies of Sybaris and Krotôn.

The Sybarites were founders of Laus and Skidrus, on the Mediterranean Sea in the Gulf of Policastro, and even of the more distant Poseidonia—now known by its Latin name of Pæstum, as well as by the temples which still remain to decorate its deserted site. They possessed twenty-five dependent towns, and ruled over four distinct native tribes or nations. What these nations were we are not told,[2] but they were probably different sections of the Œnotrian name. The Krotoniates also reached across to the Mediterranean Sea, and founded (upon the gulf now called St. Euphemia) the town of Terina, and seemingly also that of Lametini.[3] The inhabitants of the Epizephyrian Lokri, which was situated in a more southern part of Calabria Ultra near the modern town of Gerace, extended themselves in like manner across the peninsula. They founded upon the Mediterranean coast the towns of Hippônium, Medma, and Mataurum,[4] as well as Melæ and Itoneia, in localities not now exactly ascertained.

1 Strabo, vi. p. 262; Livy, xxiv. 3.

2 Strabo, vi. p. 263; v. p. 251; Skymn. Chi. v. 244; Herodot. vi. 21.

3 Stephan. Byz. v. Τέρινα—Λαμητῖνοι; Skymn. Chi. 305.

4 Thucyd. v. 5; Strabo, vi. p. 256; Skymn. Chi. 307. Steph. Byz. calls Mataurum πόλις Σικελίας.

Myskellus of Rhypes in Achaia, the founder of Krotôn under the express indication of the Delphian oracle, is said to have thought the site of Sybaris preferable, and to have solicited permission from the oracle to plant his colony there, but he was admonished to obey strictly the directions first given.[1] It is farther affirmed that the foundation of Krotôn was aided by Archias, then passing along the coast with his settlers for Syracuse, who is also brought into conjunction in a similar manner with the foundation of Lokri: but neither of these statements appears chronologically admissible. B.C. 710.

The Italian Lokri (called Epizephyrian, from the neighbourhood of Cape Zephyrium) was founded in the year 683 B.C. by settlers from the Lokrians—either the Ozolian Lokrians in the Krissæan Gulf, or those of Opus on the Eubœan Strait. This point was disputed even in antiquity, and perhaps both the one and the other may have contributed: Euanthus was the œkist of the place.[2] The first years of the Epizephyrian Lokri are said to have been years of sedition and discord. And the vile character which we hear ascribed to the primitive colonists, as well as their perfidious dealing with the natives, are the more to be noted, as the Lokrians, of the times both of Aristotle and of Polybius, fully believed these statements in regard to their own ancestors. Epizephyrian Lokri.

The original emigrants to Lokri were, according to Aristotle, a body of runaway slaves, men-stealers, and adulterers, whose only legitimate connexion with an honourable Hellenic root arose from a certain number of well-born Lokrian women who accompanied them. These women belonged to those select families called the Original settlers of Lokri—their character and circumstances.

[1] Herodot. viii. 47. Κροτωνιῆται, γένος εἰσὶν Ἀχαιοί: the date of the foundation is given by Dionysius of Halikarnassus (A. R. ii. 59).

The oracular commands delivered to Myskellus are found at length in the Fragments of Diodôrus, published by Maii (Scriptt. Vet. Fragm. x. p. 8.): compare Zenob. Proverb. Centur. iii. 42.

Though Myskellus is thus given as the œkist of Krotôn, yet we find a Krotoniatic coin with the inscription Ἡρακλῆς Οἰκίστας (Eckhel, Doctrin. Numm. Vet. vol. i. p. 172): the worship of Hêraklês at Krotôn under this title is analogous to that of Ἀπολλὼν Οἰκίστης καὶ Δωματίτης at Ægina (Pythænêtus ap. Schol. Pindar. Nem. v. 81). There were various legends respecting Hêraklês, the Eponymus Krotôn, and Lakinius. Herakleidês Ponticus, Fragm. 30, ed. Köller; Diodor. iv. 24; Ovid, Metamorph. xv. 1—53.

[2] Strabo, vi. p. 259. Euantheia, Hyantheia, or Œantheia, was one of the towns of the Ozolian Lokrians on the north side of the Krissæan Gulf, from which perhaps the emigrants may have departed, carrying with them the name and patronage of its eponymous œkist (Plutarch, Quæst. Græc. c. 15; Skylax, p. 14).

Hundred Houses, who constituted what may be called the nobility of the Lokrians in Greece Proper, and their descendants continued to enjoy a certain rank and pre-eminence in the colony even in the time of Polybius. The emigration is said to have been occasioned by disorderly intercourse between these noble Lokrian women and their slaves — perhaps by intermarriage with persons of inferior station where there had existed no recognised *connubium;*[1] a fact referred, by the informants of Aristotle, to the long duration of the first Messenian war—the Lokrian warriors having for the most part continued in the Messenian territory as auxiliaries of the Spartans during the twenty years of that war,[2] permitting themselves only rare and short visits to their homes. This is a story resembling that which we shall find in explanation of the colony of Tarentum. It comes to us too imperfectly to admit of criticism or verification; but the unamiable character of the first emigrants is a statement deserving credit, and very unlikely to have been invented. Their first proceedings on settling in Italy display a perfidy in accordance with the character ascribed to them. They found the territory in this southern portion of the Calabrian peninsula possessed by native Sikels, who, alarmed at their force and afraid to try the hazard of resistance, agreed to admit them to a participation and joint residence. The covenant was concluded and sworn to by both parties in the following terms:—"There shall be friendship between us, and we will enjoy the land in common, so long as we stand upon this earth and have heads upon our shoulders". At the time when the oath was taken, the Lokrians had put earth into their shoes and concealed heads of garlic upon their shoulders; so that when they had divested themselves of these appendages, the oath was considered as no longer binding. Availing themselves of the first convenient opportunity, they attacked the Sikels by surprise and drove them out of the territory, of which they thus acquired the exclusive possession.[3] Their first establishment was formed upon the headland itself,

Treachery towards the indigenous Sikels.

[1] Polyb. xii. 5, 8, 9: Dionys. Periêgêt. v. 365.

[2] This fact may connect the foundation of the colony of Lokri with Sparta; but the statement of Pausanias (iii. 3, 1), that the Spartans in the reign of king Polydôrus founded both Lokri and Krotôn, seems to belong to a different historical conception.

[3] Polyb. xii. 5—12.

Cape Zephyrium (now Bruzzano). But after three or four years the site of the town was moved to an eminence in the neighbouring plain, in which the Syracusans are said to have aided them.[1]

Mixture of Sikels in their territory—Sikel customs adopted.

In describing the Grecian settlers in Sicily, I have already stated that they are to be considered as Greeks with a considerable infusion of blood, of habits, and of manners, from the native Sikels. The case is the same with the Italiots or Italian Greeks, and in respect to these Epizephyrian Lokrians, especially, we find it expressly noticed by Polybius. Composed as their band was of ignoble and worthless men, not bound together by strong tribe-feelings or traditional customs, they were the more ready to adopt new practices, as well religious as civil,[2] from the Sikels. One in particular is noticed by the historian—the religious dignity called the Phialêphorus or Censer-bearer, enjoyed among the native Sikels by a youth of noble birth, who performed the duties belonging to it in their sacrifices; but the Lokrians, while they identified themselves with the religious ceremony and adopted both the name and the dignity, altered the sex, and conferred it upon one of those women of noble blood who constituted the ornament of their settlement. Even down to the days of Polybius, some maiden descended from one of these select Hundred Houses still continued to bear the title and to perform the ceremonial duties of Phialêphorus. We learn from these statements how large a portion of Sikels must have become incorporated as dependents in the colony of the Epizephyrian Lokri, and how strongly marked was the intermixture of their habits with those of the Greek settlers; while the tracing back among them of all eminence of descent to a few emigrant women of noble birth is a peculiarity belonging exclusively to their city.

That a body of colonists, formed of such unpromising materials, should have fallen into much lawlessness and disorder, is noway

[1] Strabo, vi. p. 259. We find that in the accounts given of the foundation of Korkyra, Krotôn, and Lokri, reference is made to the Syracusan settlers, either as contemporary in the way of companionship, or as auxiliaries: perhaps the accounts all come from the Syracusan historian Antiochus, who exaggerated the intervention of his own ancestors.

[2] "Nil patrium, nisi nomen, habet Romanus alumnus," observes Propertius (iv. 37) respecting the Romans: repeated with still greater bitterness in the epistle in Sallust from Mithridatês to Arsacês (p. 191, Delph. ed.). The remark is well-applicable to Lokri.

surprising; but these mischiefs appear to have become so utterly intolerable in the early years of the colony, as to force upon every one the necessity of some remedy. Hence arose a phænomenon new in the march of Grecian society—the first promulgation of written laws. The Epizephyrian Lokrians, having applied to the Delphian oracle for some healing suggestion under their distress, were directed to make laws for themselves;[1] and received the ordinances of a shepherd named Zaleukus, which he professed to have learnt from the goddess Athênê in a dream. His laws are said to have been put in writing and promulgated in 664 B.C., forty years earlier than those of Drako at Athens.

Lokrian Lawgiver Zaleukus.

That these first of all Grecian written laws were few and simple, we may be sufficiently assured. The only fact certain respecting them is their extraordinary rigour:[2] they seem to have enjoined the application of the *lex talionis* as a punishment for personal injuries. In this general character of his laws, Zaleukus was the counterpart of Drako. But so little was certainly known, and so much falsely asserted, respecting him, that Timæus the historian went so far as to call in question his real existence[3]—against the authority not only of Ephorus, but also of Aristotle and Theophrastus. The laws must have remained however, for a long time, formally unchanged; for so great was the aversion of the Lokrians, we are told, to any new law, that the man who ventured to propose one appeared in public with a rope round his neck, which was at once tightened if he failed to convince the assembly of the necessity of his proposition.[4] Of the government of the Epizephyrian Lokri we know only that

Rigour of his laws—government of Lokri.

[1] Aristot. ap. Schol. Pindar. Olymp. x. 17.

[2] Proverb. Zenob. Centur. iv. 20. Ζαλεύκου νόμος, ἐπὶ τῶν ἀποτόμων.

[3] Strabo, vi. p. 259; Skymnus Chius, v. 313; Cicero de Legg. ii. 6, and Epist. ad Atticum, vi. 1.

Heyne, Opuscula, vol. ii., Epimetrum ii. p. 60—68; Göller ad Timæi Fragment. pp. 220—259. Bentley (on the Epistles of Phalaris, ch. xii. p. 274) seems to countenance, without adequate reason, the doubt of Timæus about the existence of Zaleukus. But the statement of Ephorus, that Zaleukus had collected his ordinances from the Kretan, Laconian, and Areiopagitic customs, when contrasted with the simple and far more credible statement above-cited from Aristotle, shows how loose were the affirmations respecting the Lokrian law-giver (ap. Strabo, vi. p. 260). Other statements also concerning him, alluded to by Aristotle (Politic. ii. 9, 3), were distinctly at variance with chronology.

Charondas, the law-giver of the Chalkidic towns in Italy and Sicily, as far as we can judge amidst much confusion of testimony, seems to belong to an age much later than Zaleukus; I shall speak of him hereafter.

[4] Demosthen. cont. Timokrat. p. 744; Polyb. xii. 10.

in later times it included a great council of 1000 members, and a chief executive magistrate called Kosmopolis; it is spoken of also as strictly and carefully administered.

The date of Rhegium (Reggio), separated from the territory of the Epizephyrian Lokri by the river Halex, must have been not only earlier than Lokri, but even earlier than Sybaris—if the statement of Antiochus be correct, that the colonists were joined by those Messenians, who, prior to the first Messenian war, were anxious to make reparation to the Spartans for the outrage offered to the Spartan maidens at the temple of Artemis Limnatis, but were overborne by their countrymen and forced into exile. A different version however is given by Pausanias of this migration of Messenians to Rhegium, yet still admitting the fact of such migration at the close of the first Messenian war, which would place the foundation of the city earlier than 720 B.C. Though Rhegium was a Chalkidic colony, yet a portion of its inhabitants seem to have been undoubtedly of Messenian origin, and amongst them Anaxilas, despot of the town between 500—470 B.C., who traced his descent through two centuries to a Messenian emigrant named Alkidamidas.[1] The celebrity and power of Anaxilas, just at the time when the ancient history of the Greek towns was beginning to be set forth in prose and with some degree of system, caused the Messenian element in the population of Rhegium to be noticed prominently. But the town was essentially Chalkidic, connected by colonial sisterhood with the Chalkidic settlements in Sicily—Zanklê, Naxos, Katana, and Leontini. The original emigrants departed from Chalkis, as a tenth of the citizens consecrated by vow to Apollo in consequence of famine; and the directions of the god, as well as the invitation of the Zanklæans, guided their course to Rhegium. The town was flourishing, and acquired a considerable number of dependent villages around,[2] inhabited doubtless by cultivators of the indigenous population. But it seems to have been often at variance with the conterminous Lokrians, and received one severe defeat, in conjunction with the Tarentines, which will be hereafter recounted.

Rhegium.

Chalkidic settlements in Italy and Sicily—Rhegium, Zanklê, Naxos, Katana, Leontini.

[1] Strabo, vi. p. 257; Pausan. iv. 23, 2 λιστα ἡ τῶν Ῥηγινῶν τόλις, καὶ περιοι-
[2] Strabo, vi. p. 258. ἴσασιν δὲ μα- κίδας ἔσχε συχνάς, &c.

Between Lokri and the Lakinian cape were situated the Achæan colony of Kaulônia, and Skyllêtium; the latter seemingly included in the domain of Krotôn, though pretending to have been originally founded by Menestheus, the leader of the Athenians at the siege of Troy: Petilia, also, a hill-fortress north-west of the Lakinian cape, as well as Makalla, both comprised in the territory of Krotôn, were affirmed to have been founded by Philoktêtês. Along all this coast of the Gulf of Tarentum, there were various establishments ascribed to the heroes of the Trojan war[1]—Epeius, Philoktêtês, Nestôr—or to their returning troops. Of these establishments, probably the occupants had been small, miscellaneous, unacknowledged bands of Grecian adventurers,[2] who assumed to themselves the most honourable origin which they could imagine, and who became afterwards absorbed into the larger colonial establishments which followed; the latter adopting and taking upon themselves the heroic worship of Philoktêtês or other warriors from Troy, which the prior emigrants had begun.

Kaulônia and Skyllêtium.

During the flourishing times of Sybaris and Krotôn, it seems that these two great cities divided the whole length of the coast of the Tarentine Gulf, from the spot now called Rocco Imperiale down to the south of the Lakinian cape. Between the point where the dominion of Sybaris terminated on the Tarentine side, and Tarentum itself, there were two considerable Grecian settlements—Siris, afterwards called Herakleia, and Metapontium. The fertility and attraction of the territory of Siris, with its two rivers, Akiris and Siris, were well known even to the poet Archilochus[3] (660 B.C.), but we do not know the date at which it passed from the indigenous Chônians or Chaonians into the hands of Greek settlers. A citizen of Siris is mentioned among the suitors for the daughter of the Sikyonian Kleisthenês (580—560 B.C.). We are told that some Kolophonian fugitives, emigrating to escape the dominion of the Lydian kings, attacked and possessed themselves of the spot, giving to it the name Polieion. The Chônians of Siris ascribed to themselves a Trojan

Siris or Herakleia.

[1] Strabo, vi. p. 263; Aristot. Mirab. Ausc. c. 106; Athenæ. xii. p. 523. It is to these reputed Rhodian companions of Tlêpolemus before Troy, that the allusion in Strabo refers, to Rhodian occupants near Sybaris (xiv. p. 655).

[2] See Mannert, Geographie, part ix. b. 9, ch. 11, p. 234.

[3] Archiloch. Fragm. 17, ed. Schneidewin.

origin, exhibiting a wooden image of the Ilian Athênê, which they affirmed to have been brought away by their fugitive ancestors after the capture of Troy. When the town was stormed by the Ionians, many of the inhabitants clung to this relic for protection, but were dragged away and slain by the victors,[1] whose sacrilege was supposed to have been the cause that their settlement was not durable. At the time of the invasion of Greece by Xerxês, the fertile territory of Siritis was considered as still open to be colonised; for the Athenians, when their affairs appeared desperate, had this scheme of emigration in reserve as a possible resource;[2] and there were inspired declarations from some of the contemporary prophets which encouraged them to undertake it. At length, after the town of Thurii had been founded by Athens, in the vicinity of the dismantled Sybaris, the Thurians tried to possess themselves of the Siritid territory, but were opposed by the Tarentines.[3] According to the compromise concluded between them, Tarentum was recognised as the metropolis of the colony, but joint possession was allowed both to Tarentines and Thurians. The former transferred the site of the city, under the new name Herakleia, to a spot three miles from the sea, leaving Siris as the place of maritime access to it.[4]

About twenty-five miles eastward of Siris on the coast of the Tarentine Gulf was situated Metapontium, a Greek town which was affirmed by some to draw its origin from the Pylian companions of Nestôr—by others, from the Phokian warriors of Epeius, on their return from Troy. The proofs of the former were exhibited in the worship of the Neleid heroes,—the proofs of the latter in the preservation of the reputed identical tools with which Epeius had constructed the Trojan horse.[5] Metapontium was planted on the territory of the

Metapontium.

[1] Herodot. vi. 127; Strabo, vi. p. 262. The name Polieion seems to be read Πλεῖον in Aristot. Mirab. Auscult. 106.

Niebuhr assigns this Kolophonian settlement of Siris to the reign of Gygês in Lydia; for which I know no other evidence except the statement that Gygês took τῶν Κολοφωνίων τὸ ἄστυ (Herodot. i. 14); but this is no proof that the inhabitants then emigrated; for Kolophôn was a very flourishing and prosperous city afterwards.

Justin (xx. 2) gives a case of sacrilegious massacre committed near the statue of Athênê at Siris, which appears to be totally different from the tale respecting the Kolophonians.

[2] Herodot. viii. 62.

[3] Strabo, vi. p. 264.

[4] Strabo, *l. c.*

[5] Strabo, *l. c.*; Justin, xx. 2; Velleius Paterc. i. 1; Aristot. Mirab.

Chônians or Œnotrians, but the first colony is said to have been destroyed by an attack of the Samnites,[1] at what period we do not know. It had been founded by some Achæan settlers—under the direction of the œkist Daulius, despot of the Phokian Krissa, and invited by the inhabitants of Sybaris—who feared that the place might be appropriated by the neighbouring Tarentines, colonists from Sparta and hereditary enemies in Peloponnêsus of the Achæan race. Before the new settlers arrived, however, the place seems to have been already appropriated by the Tarentines; for the Achæan Leukippus only obtained their permission to land by a fraudulent promise, and after all had to sustain a forcible struggle both with them and with the neighbouring Œnotrians, which was compromised by a division of territory. The fertility of the Metapontine territory was hardly less celebrated than that of the Siritid.[2]

Tarentum—circumstances of its foundation.

Farther eastward of Metapontium, again at the distance of about twenty-five miles, was situated the great city of Taras or Tarentum, a colony from Sparta founded after the first Messenian war, seemingly about 707 B.C. The œkist Phalanthus, said to have been a Herakleid, was placed at the head of a body of Spartan emigrants—consisting principally of some citizens called Epeunaktæ and of the youth called Partheniæ, who had been disgraced by their countrymen on account of their origin and were on the point of breaking out into rebellion. It was out of the Messenian war that this emigration is stated to have arisen, in a manner analogous to that which has been stated respecting the Epizephyrian Lokrians. The Lacedæmonians, before entering

Auscult. c. 108. This story respecting the presence and implements of Epeius may have arisen through the Phocian settlers from Krissa.

[1] The words of Strabo—*ὑφανίσθη δ' ὑπὸ Σαυνιτῶν* (vi. p. 264) can hardly be connected with the immediately following narrative which he gives out of Antiochus, respecting the revival of the place by new Achæan settlers, invited by the Achæans of Sybaris. For the latter place was reduced to impotence in 510 B.C.: invitations by the Achæans of Sybaris must therefore be anterior to that date. If Daulius despot of Krissa is to be admitted as the œkist of Metapontium, the plantation of it must be placed early in the first half of the sixth century B.C.; but there is great difficulty in admitting the extension of Samnite conquests to the Gulf of Tarentum at so early a period as this. I therefore construe the words of Antiochus as referring to the original settlement of Metapontium by the Greeks, not to the revival of the town after its destruction by the Samnites.

[2] Strabo, *l. c.*; Stephanus Byz. (*v. Μεταπόντιον*) identifies Metapontium and Siris in a perplexing manner.

Livy (xxv. 15) recognises Metapontium as Achæan: compare Heyne, Opuscula, vol. ii., Prolus. xii. p. 207.

Messenia to carry on the war, had made a vow not to return until they should have completed the conquest; a vow in which it appears that some of them declined to take part, standing altogether aloof from the expedition. When the absent soldiers returned, after many years of absence consumed in the war, they found a numerous progeny which had been born to their wives and daughters during the interval, from intercourse with those (Epeunaktæ) who had stayed at home. The Epeunaktæ were punished by being degraded to the rank and servitude of Helots; the children thus born, called Partheniæ,[1] were also cut off from all the rights of citizenship, and held in dishonour. But the parties punished were numerous enough to make themselves formidable, and a conspiracy was planned among them, intended to break out at the great religious festival of the Hyakinthia, in the temple of the Amyklæan Apollo. Phalanthus was the secret chief of the conspirators, who agreed to commence their attack upon the authorities at the moment when he should put on his helmet. The leader, however, never intending that the scheme should be executed, betrayed it beforehand, stipulating for the safety of all those implicated in it. At the commencement of the festival, when the multitude were already assembled, a herald was directed to proclaim aloud than Phalanthus would not on that day put on his helmet — a proclamation which at once revealed to the conspirators that they were betrayed. Some of them sought safety in flight, others assumed the posture of suppliants; but they were merely detained in confinement, with assurance of safety, while Phalanthus was sent to the Delphian oracle to ask advice respecting emigration. He is said to have inquired whether he might be permitted to appropriate the fertile plain of Sikyôn, but the Pythian priestess emphatically dissuaded him, and enjoined him to conduct his emigrants to Satyrium and Tarentum, where he would be "a mischief to the Iapygians". Phalanthus obeyed, and conducted the detected conspirators as emigrants to the Tarentine Gulf,[2] which he reached a few years

The Partheniæ—Phalanthus the œkist.

[1] Partheniæ, *i.e. children of virgins*: the description given by Varro of the Illyrian *virgines* illustrates this phrase: —"Quas *virgines* ibi appellant, nonnunquam annorum xx, quibus mos eorum non denegavit, ante nuptias ut succumberent quibus vellent, et incomitatis ut vagari liceret, et *liberos habere*". (Varro, De Re Rustica, ii, 10, 9.)

[2] For this story respecting the foundation of Tarentum, see Strabo,

after the foundation of Sybaris and Krotôn by the Achæans. According to Ephorus, he found these prior emigrants at war with the natives, aided them in the contest, and received in return their aid to accomplish his own settlement. But this can hardly have consisted with the narrative of Antiochus, who represented the Achæans of Sybaris as retaining even in their colonies the hatred against the Dorian name which they had contracted in Peloponnêsus.[1] Antiochus stated that Phalanthus and his colonists were received in a friendly manner by the indigenous inhabitants and allowed to establish their new town in tranquillity.

Situation and territory of Tarentum.

If such was really the fact, it proves that the native inhabitants of the soil must have been of purely inland habits, making no use of the sea either for commerce or for fishery, otherwise they would hardly have relinquished such a site as that of Tarentum—which, while favourable and productive even in regard to the adjoining land, was with respect to sea-advantages without a parallel in Grecian Italy.[2] It was the only spot in the Gulf which possessed a perfectly safe and convenient harbour. A spacious inlet of the sea is there formed, sheltered by an isthmus and an outlying peninsula so as to leave only a narrow entrance. This inlet, still known as the Mare Piccolo, though its shores and the adjoining tongue of land appear to have undergone much change, affords at the present day a constant, inexhaustible, and varied supply of fish, especially of shell-fish, which furnish both nourishment and employment to a large proportion among the inhabitants of the contracted modern Taranto, just as they once served the same purpose to the numerous, lively, and jovial population of the mighty Tarentum. The concentrated population of fishermen

vi. p. 278—280 (who gives the versions both of Antiochus and Ephorus); Justin, iii. 4; Diodôrus, xv. 66; Excerpta Vatican. lib. vii.—x., ed. Maii, Fr. 12; Servius ad Virgil. Æneid. iii. 551.

There are several points of difference between Antiochus, Ephorus, and Servius; the story given in the text follows the former.

The statement of Hesychius (v. Παρθενεῖαι) seems on the whole somewhat more intelligible than that given by Strabo—Οἱ κατὰ τὸν Μεσσηνιακὸν πόλεμον αὐτοῖς γενόμενοι ἐκ τῶν θεραπαίνων· καὶ οἱ ἐξ ἀνεκδότου λάθρα γεννώμενοι παῖδες. Justin translates Partheniæ, *Spurii*.

The local eponymous heroes Taras and Satyrus (from Satyrium) were celebrated and worshipped among the Tarentines. See Cicero, Verr. iv. 60, 13; Servius ad Virg. Georg. ii. 197; Zumpt. ap. Orelli, Onomasticon Tullian. ii. p. 570.

[1] Compare Strabo, vi. p. 264 and p. 280.

[2] Strabo, vi. p. 278; Polyb. x. 1.

formed a predominant element in the character of the Tarentine democracy.[1] Tarentum was just on the borders of the country originally known as Italy, within which Herodotus includes it, while Antiochus considers it in Iapygia, and regards Metapontium as the last Greek town in Italy.

Its immediate neighbours were the Iapygians, who, under various subdivisions of name and dialect, seem to have occupied the greater part of south-eastern Italy, including the peninsula denominated after them (yet sometimes also called the Salentine), between the Adriatic and the Tarentine Gulf,—and who are even stated at one time to have occupied some territory on the south-east of that Gulf, near the site of Krotôn. The Iapygian name appears to have comprehended Messapians, Salentines, and Kalabrians; according to some even Peuketians and Daunians, as far along the Adriatic as Mount Garganus or Drion: Skylax notices in his time (about 360 B.C.) Iapygians.

[1] Juvenal, Sat. vi. 297. "Atque coronatum et petulans madidumque Tarentum:" compare Plato, Legg. i. p. 637: and Horat. Satir. ii. 4, 34. Aristot. Polit. iv. 4, 1. οἱ ἁλιεῖς ἐν Τάραντι καὶ Βυζαντίῳ. "Tarentina ostrea," Varro, Fragm. p. 301, ed. Bipont.

To illustrate this remark of Aristotle on the fishermen of Tarentum as the predominant class in the democracy, I transcribe a passage from Mr. Keppel Craven's Tour in the Southern Provinces of Naples, ch. x. p. 182:—"Swinburne gives a list of ninety-three different sorts of shell-fish which are found in the Gulf of Taranto; but more especially in the Mare Piccolo. Among these, in ancient times, the murex and purpura ranked foremost in value; in our degenerate days the mussel and oyster seem to have usurped a pre-eminence as acknowledged but less dignified; but there are numerous other tribes held in proportionate estimation for their exquisite flavour, and as greedily sought for during their respective seasons. The appetite for shell-fish of all sorts, which seems peculiar to the natives of these regions, is such as to appear exaggerated to a foreigner, accustomed to consider only a few of them as eatable. This taste exists at Taranto, if possible, in a stronger degree than in any other part of the kingdom, and accounts for the comparatively large revenue which government draws from this particular branch of commerce. The Mare Piccolo is divided into several portions, which are let to different societies, who thereby become the only privileged fishermen; the lower classes are almost all employed by these corporations, as every revolving season of the year affords occupation for them, so that nature herself seems to have afforded the exclusive trade most suited to the inhabitants of Taranto. Both seas abound with varieties of testacea, but the inner gulf (the Mare Piccolo) is esteemed most favourable to their growth and flavour; the sandy bed is literally blackened by the mussels that cover it; the boats that glide over its surface are laden with them; they emboss the rocks that border the strand, and appear equally abundant on the shore, piled up in heaps." Mr. Craven goes on to illustrate still farther the wonderful abundance of this fishery; but that which has been already transcribed, while it illustrates the above-noticed remark of Aristotle, will at the same time help to explain the prosperity and physical abundance of the ancient Tarentum.

For an elaborate account of the state of cultivation, especially of the olive, near the degenerate modern Taranto, see the Travels of M. de Salis Marschlins in the Kingdom of Naples (translated by Aufrere, London, 1795), sect. 5, pp. 82—107, 163—178.

five different tongues in the country which he calls Iapygia.[1] The Messapians and Salentines are spoken of as immigrants from Krête, akin to the Minoian or primitive Kretans; and we find a national genealogy which recognises Iapyx, son of Dædalus, an immigrant from Sicily. But the story told to Herodotus was, that the Kretan soldiers who had accompanied Minos in his expedition to recover Dædalus from Kamikus in Sicily, were on their return home cast away on the shores of Iapygia, and became the founders of Hyria and other Messapian towns in the interior of the country.[2] Brundusium also, or Brentesion as the Greeks called it,[3] inconsiderable in the days of Herodotus, but famous in the Roman times afterwards as the most frequented sea-port for voyaging to Epirus, was a Messapian town. The native language spoken by the Iapygian Messapians was a variety of the Oscan: the Latin poet Ennius, a native of Rudiæ in the Iapygian peninsula, spoke Greek, Latin, and Oscan, and even deduced his pedigree from the ancient national prince or hero Messapus.[4]

Messapians.

We are told that during the lifetime of Phalanthus, the Tarentine settlers gained victories over the Messapians and Peuketians, which they commemorated afterwards by votive offerings at Delphi, and that they even made acquisitions at the expense of the inhabitants of Brundusium[5]—a statement difficult to believe, if we look to the distance of the latter place, and to the circumstance that Herodotus even in his time names it only as a harbour. Phalanthus too, driven into exile, is said to have found a hospitable reception at Brundusium and to have died there. Of the history of Tarentum, however, during the first 230 years of its existence, we possess no details. We have reason

[1] Skylax does not mention at all the name of Italy; he gives to the whole coast, from Rhegium to Poseidonia on the Mediterranean, and from the same point to the limit between Thurii and Herakleia on the Gulf of Tarentum, the name of Lucania (c. 12, 13). From this point he extends Iapygia to the Mount Drion or Garganus, so that he includes not only Metapontium, but also Herakleia in Iapygia.

Antiochus draws the line between Italy and Iapygia at the extremity of the Metapontine territory; comprehending Metapontium in Italy, and Tarentum in Iapygia (Antiochus, Frag. 6, ed. Didot; ap. Strabo. vi. p. 254).

Herodotus however speaks not only of Metapontium, but also of Tarentum, as being in Italy (i. 24; iii. 136; iv. 15).

[2] Herodot. vii. 170; Pliny, H. N. iii. 16; Athenæ. xii. p. 523; Servius ad Virgil. Æneid. viii. 9.

[3] Herodot. iv. 99.

[4] Servius ad Virgil. Æneid. vii. 691. Polybius distinguishes Iapygians from Messapians (ii. 21).

[5] Pausanias, x. 10, 3; x. 13, 5; Strabo, vi. p. 282; Justin, iii. 4.

to believe that it partook in the general prosperity of the Italian Greeks during those two centuries, though remaining inferior both to Sybaris and to Krotôn. About the year 510 B.C. these two latter republics went to war, and Sybaris was nearly destroyed; while in the subsequent half-century the Krotoniates suffered the terrible defeat of Sagra from the Lokrians, and the Tarentines experienced an equally ruinous defeat from the Iapygian Messapians. From these reverses, however, the Tarentines appear to have recovered more completely than the Krotoniates; for the former stand first among the Italiots or Italian Greeks, from the year 400 B.C. down to the supremacy of the Romans, and made better head against the growth of the Lucanians and Bruttians of the interior.

Such were the chief cities of the Italian Greeks from Tarentum on the upper sea to Poseidonia on the lower; and if we take them during the period preceding the ruin of Sybaris (in 510 B.C.), they will appear to have enjoyed a degree of prosperity even surpassing that of the Sicilian Greeks. The dominion of Sybaris, Krotôn, and Lokri extended across the peninsula from sea to sea. The mountainous regions of the interior of Calabria were held in amicable connexion with the cities and cultivators in the plain and valley near the sea—to the reciprocal advantage of both. The petty native tribes of Œnotrians, Sikels, or Italians, properly so-called, were partially hellenised, and brought into the condition of village cultivators and shepherds dependent upon Sybaris and its fellow-cities; a portion of them dwelling in the town, probably, as domestic slaves of the rich men, but most of them remaining in the country region as serfs, Penestæ, or coloni, intermingled with Greek settlers, and paying over parts of their produce to Greek proprietors.

Prosperity of the Italian Greeks between 700—500 B.C.

But this dependence, though accomplished in the first instance by force, was yet not upheld exclusively by force. It was to a great degree the result of an organised march of life, and of more productive cultivation brought within their reach—of new wants, both created and supplied—of temples, festivals, ships, walls, chariots, &c., which imposed upon the imagination of the rude landsmen and shepherds. Against mere force the natives could have found shelter in the unconquerable forests and ravines of

the Calabrian Apennines, and in that vast mountain region of the Sila, lying immediately behind the plains of Sybaris, where even the French army with its excellent organisation in 1807 found so much difficulty in reaching the bandit villagers.[1] It was not by arms alone, but by arms and arts combined—a mingled influence, such as enabled imperial Rome to subdue the fierceness of the rude Germans and Britons—that the Sybarites and Krotoniates acquired and maintained their ascendency over the natives of the interior. The shepherd of the banks of the river Sybaris or Krathis not only found a new exchangeable value for his cattle and other produce, becoming familiar with better diet and clothing and improved cultivation of the olive and the vine, but he was also enabled to display his prowess, if strong and brave, in the public games at the festival of the Lakinian Hêrê, or even at the Olympic games in Peloponnêsus.[2] It is thus that we have to explain the extensive dominion, the great population, and the wealth and luxury of the Sybarites and Krotoniates—a population of which the incidental reports as given in figures are not trustworthy, but which we may well believe to have been very numerous. The native Œnotrians, while unable to combine in resisting Greek force, were at the same time less widely distinguished from the Greeks in race and language, than the Oscans of Middle Italy, and therefore more accessible to Greek pacific influences; while the Oscan race seem to have been both fiercer in repelling the assaults of the Greeks, and more intractable as to their seductions. The Iapygians were not modified by the neighbourhood of Tarentum in the same degree as the tribes adjoining to Sybaris and Krotôn by their contact with those cities. The dialect of Tarentum,[3] as well as of

Ascendency over the Œnotrian population.

[1] See a description of the French military operations in these almost inaccessible regions, contained in a valuable publication by a French general officer, on service in that country for three years, "Calabria during a military residence of three years," London, 1832, Letter xx. p. 201.

The whole picture of Calabria contained in this volume is both interesting and instructive: military operations had never before been carried on, probably, in the mountains of the Sila.

[2] See Theokritus, Idyll. iv. 6—35, which illustrates the point here stated.

[3] Suidas, v. Ῥίνθων; Stephan. Byz. v. Τάρας: compare Bernhardy, Grundriss der Römischen Literatur, Abschnitt ii. pt. 2, p. 185, 186, about the analogy of these φλύακες of Rhinthôn with the native Italic Mimes.

The dialect of the other cities of Italic Greece is very little known: the ancient Inscription of Betilia is Doric: see Ahrens, De Dialecto Dorica, sect. 49, p. 418.

Herakleia, though a marked Doric, admitted many local peculiarities; and the farces of the Tarentine poet Rhinthôn, like the Syracusan Sophrôn, seem to have blended the Hellenic with the Italic in language as well as in character.

About the year 560 B.C., the time of the accession of Peisistratus at Athens, the close of what may properly be called the first period of Grecian history, Sybaris and Krotôn were at the maximum of their power, which each maintained for half a century afterwards, until the fatal dissension between them. We are told that the Sybarites in that final contest marched against Krotôn with an army of 300,000 men. Fabulous as this number doubtless is, we cannot doubt that for an irruption of this kind into an adjoining territory, their large body of semi-hellenised native subjects might be mustered in prodigious force. The few statements which have reached us respecting them touch, unfortunately, upon little more than their luxury, fantastic self-indulgence, and extravagant indolence, for which qualities they have become proverbial in modern times as well as in ancient. Anecdotes illustrating these qualities were current, and served more than one purpose in antiquity. The philosopher recounted them in order to discredit and denounce the character which they exemplified: while among gay companies, "Sybaritic tales," or tales respecting sayings and doings of ancient Sybarites, formed a separate and special class of excellent stories to be told simply for amusement[1]—with which view witty romancers multiplied them indefinitely. It is probable that the Pythagorean philosophers (who belonged originally to Krotôn, but maintained themselves permanently as a philosophical sect in Italy and Sicily, with a strong tinge of ostentatious asceticism and mysticism), in their exhortations to temperance and in their denunciations of luxurious habits, might select by preference examples from

Krotôn and Sybaris—at their maximum from 560—510 B.C.

[1] Aristoph. Vesp. 1260. Αἰσωπικὸν ἄρματος, &c.—ἐν Συβάρει γυνή ποτε γελοῖον, ἢ Συβαριτικόν. What is meant by Συβαριτικὸν γελοῖον is badly explained by the Scholiast, but is perfectly well illustrated by Aristophanês himself in subsequent verses of the same play (1427—1436), where Philokleôn tells two good stories respecting "a Sybaritan man," and a "woman in Sybaris": Ἀνὴρ Συβαρίτης ἐξέπεσεν ἐξ Κατέαξ' ἐχῖνον, &c.

These Συβάρια ἐπιφθέγματα are as old as Epicharmus, whose mind was much imbued with the Pythagorean philosophy. See Etymolog. Magn. Συβαρίζειν. Ælian amused himself also with the ἱστορίαι Συβαριτικαί (V. H. xiv. 20): compare Hesychius, Συβαριτικοὶ λόγοι, and Suidas, Συβαριτικαῖς.

Sybaris, the ancient enemy of the Krotoniates, to point their moral; and that the exaggerated reputation of the city thus first became the subject of common talk throughout the Grecian world. For little could be actually known of Sybaris in detail, since its humiliation dates from the first commencement of Grecian contemporaneous history. Hekatæus of Milêtus may perhaps have visited it in its full splendour, but even Herodotus knew it only by past report; and the principal anecdotes respecting it are cited from authors considerably later than him, who follow the tone of thought so common in antiquity, in ascribing the ruin of the Sybarites to their overweening corruption and luxury.[1]

The Sybarites—their luxury—their organisation, industry, and power.

Making allowance, however, for exaggeration on all these accounts, there can be no reason to doubt that Sybaris, in 560 B.C., was one of the most wealthy, populous, and powerful cities of the Hellenic name; and that it also presented both comfortable abundance among the mass of the citizens, arising from the easy attainment of fresh lots of fertile land, and excessive indulgences among the rich—to a degree forming marked contrast with Hellas Proper, of which Herodotus characterised Poverty as the foster-sister.[2] The extraordinary productiveness of the neighbouring territory—alleged by Varro, in his time, when the culture must have been much worse than it had been under the old Sybaris, to yield an ordinary crop of a hundred-fold,[3] and extolled by modern travellers even in its pre-

[1] Thus Herodotus (vi. 127) informs us that at the time when Kleisthenês of Sikyôn invited from all Greece suitors of proper dignity for the hand of his daughter, Smindyridês of Sybaris came among the number, "the most delicate and luxurious man ever known" (ἐπὶ πλεῖστον δὴ χλιδῆς εἶς ἀνὴρ ἀφίκετο—Herodot. vi. 127), and Sybaris was at that time (B.C. 580—560) in its greatest prosperity. In Chamæleon, Timæus, and other writers subsequent to Aristotle, greater details were given. Smindyridês was said to have taken with him to the marriage 100 domestic servants, fishermen, bird-catchers, and cooks (Athenæ. vi. 271; xii. 541). The details of Sybaritic luxury, given in Athenæus, are chiefly borrowed from writers of this post-Aristotelian age—Herakleidês of Pontus, Phylarchus, Klearchus, Timæus (Athenæ. vii. 519—522). The best-authenticated of all the examples of Sybaritic wealth is the splendid figured garment, fifteen cubits in length, which Alkimenês the Sybarite dedicated as a votive offering in the temple of the Lakinian Hêrê. Dionysius of Syracuse plundered that temple, got possession of the garment, and is said to have sold it to the Carthaginians for the price of 120 talents: Polemôn the Periêgêtês seems to have seen it at Carthage (Aristot. Mirab. Ausc. 96; Athenæ. xii. 541). Whether the price be correctly stated, we are not in a situation to determine.

[2] Herodot. vii. 102. τῇ Ἑλλάδι πενίη μὲν αἰεί κοτε σύντροφός ἐστι.

[3] Varro, De Re Rustica, i. 44. "In

sent yet more neglected culture—has been already touched upon. The river Krathis—still the most considerable river of that region—at a time when there was an industrious population to keep its water-course in order, would enable the extensive fields of Sybaris to supply abundant nourishment for a population larger perhaps than any other Grecian city could parallel. But though nature was thus bountiful, industry, good management, and well-ordered government were required to turn her bounty to account: where these are wanting, later experience of the same territory shows that its inexhaustible capacities may exist in vain. That luxury which Grecian moralists denounced in the leading Sybarites between 560 and 510 B.C., was the result of acquisitions vigorously and industriously pushed, and kept together by an orderly central force, during a century and a half that the colony had existed. Though the Trœzenian settlers who formed a portion of the original emigrants had been expelled when the Achæans became more numerous, yet we are told that, on the whole, Sybaris was liberal in the reception of new immigrants to the citizenship,[1] and that this was one of the causes of its remarkable advance. Of these additional comers we may presume that many went to form its colonies on the Mediterranean Sea, and some to settle both among its four dependent inland nations and its twenty-five subject towns. Five thousand horsemen, we are told, clothed in showy attire,

Sybaritano dicunt etiam cum centesimo redire solitum." The land of the Italic Greeks stands first for wheaten bread and beef; that of Syracuse for pork and cheese (Hermippus ap. Athenæ. i. p. 27): about the excellent wheat of Italy, compare Sophoklês, Triptolem. Frag. 529, ed. Dindorf.

Theophrastus dwells upon the excellence of the land near Mylæ, in the territory of the Sicilian Messênê, which produced (according to him) thirty-fold (Hist. Plant. ix. 2, 8, p. 259, ed. Schneid.). This affords some measure of comparison both for the real excellence of the ancient Sybaritan territory, and for the estimation in which it was held: its estimated produce being more than three times that of Mylæ.

See in Mr. Keppel Craven's Tour in the Southern Provinces of Naples (chapters xi.—xii. pp. 212—218), the description of the rich and productive plain of the Krathis (in the midst of which stood the ancient Sybaris), extending about sixteen miles from Cassano to Corigliano, and about twelve miles from the former town to the sea. Compare also the picture of the same country in the work by a French officer referred to in a previous note, "Calabria during a military residence of three years," London, 1832, Letter xxii. p. 219—226.

Hekatæus (c. 39, ed. Klausen) calls Cosa—Κόσσα, πόλις Οἰνωτρῶν ἐν μεσογαίᾳ. Cosa is considered to be identical, seemingly on good grounds, with the modern Cassano (Cæsar, Bell, Civ. iii. 22): assuming this to be correct, there must have been an Œnotrian dependent town within eight miles of the ancient city of Sybaris.

[1] Diodôr. xii. 9.

formed the processional march in certain Sybaritic festivals—a number which is best appreciated by comparison with the fact, that the knights or horsemen of Athens in her best days did not exceed 1200. The Sybaritic horses, if we are to believe a story purporting to come from Aristotle, were taught to move to the sound of the flute; and the garments of these wealthy citizens were composed of the finest wool from Milêtus in Ionia[1]—the Tarentine wool not having then acquired the distinguished renown which it possessed five centuries afterwards towards the close of the Roman republic. Next to the great abundance of home produce—corn, wine, oil, flax, cattle, fish, timber, &c.—the fact next in importance which we hear respecting Sybaris is the great traffic carried on with Milêtus: these two cities were more intimately and affectionately connected together than any two Hellenic cities within the knowledge of Herodotus.[2] The tie between Tarentum and Knidus was also of a very intimate character,[3] so that the great intercourse, personal as well as commercial, between the Asiatic and the Italic Greeks, appears as a marked fact in the history of the sixth century before the Christian æra.

In this respect, as well as in several others, the Hellenic world wears a very different aspect in 560 B.C. from that which it assumed a century afterwards, and in which it is best known to modern readers. At the former period the Ionic and Italic Greeks are the great ornaments of the Hellenic name, carrying on a more lucrative trade with each other than either of them maintained with Greece Proper; which both of them recognised as their mother country, though without admitting anything in the nature of established headship. The military power of Sparta is indeed at this time great and preponderant in Peloponnêsus, but she has no navy, and she is only just essaying her strength, not without reluctance, in ultramarine interference. After the lapse of a century, these circumstances change materially. The independence of the

Grecian world about 560 B.C. Ionic and Italic Greeks are then the most prominent among Greeks.

[1] Athenæus, xii. p. 519.

[2] Herodot. vi. 21. Respecting the great abundance of ship-timber in the territory of the Italiots (Italic Greeks), see Thucyd. vi. 90; vii. 25. The pitch from the pine forests in the Sila was also abundant and celebrated (Strabo, vi. p. 261).

[3] Herodot. iii. 138.

Asiatic Greeks is destroyed, and the power of the Italic Greeks is greatly broken; while Sparta and Athens not only become the prominent and leading Hellenic States, but constitute themselves centres of action for the lesser cities to a degree previously unknown.

It was during the height of their prosperity, seemingly, in the sixth century B.C., that the Italic Greeks either acquired for, or bestowed upon, their territory the appellation of Magna Græcia, which at that time it well deserved; for not only were Sybaris and Krotôn then the greatest Grecian cities situated near together, but the whole peninsula of Calabria may be considered as attached to the Grecian cities on the coast. The native Œnotrians and Sikels occupying the interior had become hellenised or semi-hellenised with a mixture of Greeks among them—common subjects of these great cities. The whole extent of the Calabrian peninsula, within an imaginary straight line carried from Sybaris to Poseidonia, might then be fairly considered as Hellenic territory. Sybaris maintained much traffic with the Tuscan towns in the Mediterranean; so that the communication between Greece and Rome, across the Calabrian isthmus,[1] may perhaps have been easier during the time of the Roman kings (whose expulsion was nearly contemporaneous with the ruin of Sybaris) than it became afterwards during the first two centuries of the Roman republic. But all these relations underwent a complete change after the breaking up of the power of Sybaris in 510 B.C., and the gradual march of the Oscan population from Middle Italy towards the south. Cumæ was overwhelmed by the Samnites, Poseidonia by the Lucanians; who became possessed not only of these maritime cities, but also of the whole inland territory (now called the Basilicata, with part of the Hither Calabria) across from Poseidonia to the neighbourhood of the Gulf of Tarentum: while the Bruttians—a mixture of outlying Lucanians with the Greco-Œnotrian population once subject to Sybaris, speaking both Greek and Oscan[2]—became masters of the inland mountains in the Farther Calabria from Consentia nearly to the Sicilian strait. It was thus that the ruin of Sybaris, combined with the spread of the Lucanians and Bruttians, deprived the Italic

Consequences of the fall of Sybaris.

[1] Athenæus, xii. p. 519.

[2] Festus, v. bilingues Brutates.

Greeks of that inland territory which they had enjoyed in the sixth century B.C., and restricted them to the neighbourhood of the coast. To understand the extraordinary power and prosperity of Sybaris and Krotôn, in the sixth century B.C., when the whole of this inland territory was subject to them, and before the rise of the Lucanians and Bruttians, and when the name Magna Græcia was first given — it is necessary to glance by contrast at these latter periods; more especially since the same name still continued to be applied by the Romans to Italic Greece after the contraction of territory had rendered it less appropriate.

Of Krotôn at this early period of its power and prosperity we know even less than of Sybaris. It stood distinguished both for the number of its citizens who received prizes at the Olympic games, and for the excellence of its surgeons or physicians. And what may seem more surprising, if we consider the extreme present insalubrity of the site upon which it stood, it was in ancient times proverbially healthy,[1] which was not so much the case with the more fertile Sybaris. Respecting all these cities of Italic Greeks, the same remark is applicable as was before made in reference to the Sicilian Greeks—that the intermixture of the native population sensibly affected both their character and habits. We have no information respecting their government during this early period of prosperity, except that we find mention at Krotôn (as at the Epizephyrian Lokri) of a senate of 1000 members, yet not excluding occasionally the ecclesia or general assembly.[2] Probably the steady increase of their dominion in the interior, and the facility of providing maintenance for new population, tended much to make their political systems, whatever they may have been, work in a satisfactory manner. The attempt of Pythagoras and his followers to constitute themselves a ruling faction as well as a philosophical sect will be recounted in a subsequent chapter. The proceedings connected with that attempt will show that there was considerable analogy and sympathy between the various cities of Italian Greece, so as to render them liable to be acted on by the same causes. But

Krotoniates —their salubrity, strength, success in the Olympic games, &c.

[1] Strabo, vi. p. 262.
[2] Jamblichus, Vit. Pythagor. c. 9. p. 33; c. 35, p. 210.

though the festivals of the Lakinian Hêrê, administered by the Krotoniates, formed from early times a common point of religious assemblage to all[1]—yet the attempts to institute periodical meetings of deputies, for the express purpose of maintaining political harmony, did not begin until after the destruction of Sybaris, nor were they ever more than partially successful.

One other city, the most distant colony founded by Greeks in the western regions, yet remains to be mentioned; and we can do no more than mention it, since we have no facts to make up its history. Massalia, the modern Marseilles, was founded by the Ionic Phokæans in the 45th Olympiad, about 597 B.C.,[2] at the time when Sybaris and Krotôn were near the maximum of their power—when the peninsula of Calabria was all Hellenic, and when Cumæ also had not yet been visited by those calamities which brought about its decline. So much Hellenism in the south of Italy doubtless facilitated the western progress of the adventurous Phokæan mariner. It would appear that Massalia was founded by amicable fusion of Phokæan colonists with the indigenous Gauls, if we may judge by the romantic legend of the Protiadæ, a Massaliotic family or gens existing in the time of Aristotle. Euxenus, a Phokæan merchant, had contracted friendly relations with Nanus, a native chief in the south of Gaul, and was invited to the festival in which the latter was about to celebrate the marriage of his daughter Petta. According to the custom of the country, the maiden was to choose for herself a husband among the guests by presenting him with a cup: through accident, or by preference, Petta presented it to Euxenus, and became his wife. Prôtis of Massalia, the offspring of this marriage, was the primitive ancestor and eponym of the Protiadæ. According to another story respecting the origin of the same gens, Prôtis was himself the Phokæan leader who married Gyptis, daughter of Nannus king of the Segobrigian Gauls.[3]

Massalia.

[1] Athenæus, xii. 541.

[2] This date depends upon Timæus (as quoted by Skymnus Chius, 210) and Solinûs; there seems no reason for distrusting it, though Thucydidês (i. 13) and Isokratês (Archidamus, p. 316) seem to conceive Massalia as founded by the Phokæans about 60 years later, when Ionia was conquered by Harpagus (see Bruckner, Historia Reip. Massiliensium, sect. 2, p. 9, and Raoul Rochette, Histoire des Colonies Grecques, vol. iii. pp. 405–413, who however puts the arrival of the Phokæans, in these regions and at Tartêssus, much too early).

[3] Aristotle, Μασσαλιώτων πολιτεία, ap. Athenæum, xiii. p. 576; Justin,

Of the history of Massalia we know little, nor does it appear to have been connected with the general movement of the Grecian world. We learn generally that the Massaliots administered their affairs with discretion as well as with unanimity, and exhibited in their private habits an exemplary modesty—that although preserving alliance with the people of the interior, they were scrupulously vigilant in guarding their city against surprise, permitting no armed strangers to enter—that they introduced the culture of vines and olives, and gradually extended the Greek alphabet, language, and civilization among the neighbouring Gauls—that they not only possessed and fortified many positions along the coast of the Gulf of Lyons, but also founded five colonies along the eastern coast of Spain—that their government was oligarchical, consisting of a perpetual senate of 600 persons, yet admitting occasionally new members from without, and a small council of fifteen members—that the Delphinian Apollo and the Ephesian Artemis were their chief deities, planted as guardians of their outlying posts, and transmitted to their colonies.[1] Although it is common to represent a deliberate march and steady supremacy of the governing few, with contented obedience on the part of the many, as the characteristic of Dorian states, and mutability not less than disturbance as the prevalent tendency in Ionian—yet there is no Grecian community to whom the former attributes are more pointedly ascribed than the Ionic Massalia. The commerce of the Massaliots appears to have been extensive, and their armed maritime force sufficiently powerful to defend it against the aggressions of Carthage—their principal enemy in the western Mediterranean.

xliii. 3. Plutarch (Solôn, c. 2) seems to follow the same story as Justin.

[1] Strabo, iv. p. 179—182; Justin, xliii. 4—5; Cicero, Pro Flacco, 26. It rather appears from Aristotle (Polit. v. 5, 2; vi. 4—5) that the senate was originally a body completely close, which gave rise to discontent on the part of wealthy men not included in it: a mitigation took place by admitting into it, occasionally, men selected from the latter.

Some authors seem to have accused the Massaliots of luxurious and effeminate habits (see Athenæus, xii. p. 523).

# CHAPTER XXIII.

## GRECIAN COLONIES IN AND NEAR EPIRUS.

On the eastern side of the Ionian Sea were situated the Grecian colonies of Korkyra, Leukas, Anaktorium, Ambrakia, Apollonia, and Epidamnus.

Among these, by far the most distinguished, for situation, for wealth, and for power, was Korkyra—now known as Corfu, the same name belonging, as in antiquity, both to the town and the island, which is separated from the coast of Epirus by a strait varying from two to seven miles in breadth. Korkyra was founded by the Corinthians at the same time (we are told) as Syracuse. Chersikratês, a Bacchiad, is said to have accompanied Archias on his voyage from Corinth to Syracuse, and to have been left with a company of emigrants on the island of Korkyra, where he founded a settlement.[1] What inhabitants he found there, or how they were dealt with, we cannot clearly make out. The island was generally conceived in antiquity as the residence of the Homeric Phæakians, and it is to this fact that Thucydidês ascribes in part the eminence of the Korkyræan marine.[2] According to another story, some Eretrians from Eubœa had settled there, and were compelled to retire. A third statement represents the Liburnians[3] as the prior inhabitants—and this perhaps is the most probable, since the Liburnians were an enterprising, maritime, piratical race, who long continued to occupy the more northerly islands in the Adriatic along the Illyrian and Dalmatian coast. That maritime activity, and number of ships both warlike and commercial, which we find at an early date among the Korkyræans, and in which they stand

Korkyra.

[1] Strabo, vi. p. 269: compare Timæus, Fragm. 49, ed. Göller; Fr. 53, ed. Didot.

[2] Thucyd. i. 25.

[3] Strabo, *l. c.*; Plutarch, Quæst. Græc. c. 11: a different fable in Conôn, Narrat. 3, ap. Photium, Cod. 86.

distinguished from the Italian and Sicilian Greeks, may be plausibly attributed to their partial fusion with pre-existing Liburnians; for the ante-Hellenic natives of Magna Græcia and Sicily (as has been already noticed) were as unpractised at sea as the Liburnians were expert.

Early foundation of Korkyra from Corinth.

At the time when the Corinthians were about to colonize Sicily, it was natural that they should also wish to plant a settlement at Korkyra, which was a post of great importance for facilitating the voyage from Peloponnêsus to Italy, and was farther convenient for traffic with Epirus, at that period altogether non-Hellenic. Their choice of a site was fully justified by the prosperity and power of the colony, which, however, though sometimes in combination with the mother-city, was more frequently alienated from her and hostile, and continued so throughout most part of the three centuries from 700—400 B.C.[1] Perhaps also Molykreia and Chalkis,[2] on the south-western coast of Ætolia, not far from the mouth of the Corinthian Gulf, may have been founded by Corinth at a date hardly less early than Korkyra.

Relations of Korkyra with Corinth.

It was at Corinth that the earliest improvements in Greek ship-building, and the first construction of the trireme or war-ship with a triple bank of oars, was introduced. It was probably from Corinth that this improvement passed to Korkyra, as it did to Samos. In early times, the Korkyræan navy was in a condition to cope with the Corinthian; and the most ancient naval battle known to Thucydidês[3] was one between these two states, in 664 B.C. As far as we can make out, it appears that Korkyra maintained her independence not only during the government of the Bacchiads at Corinth, but also throughout the long reign of the despot Kypselus, and a part of the reign of his son Periander. But towards the close of this latter reign, we find Korkyra subject to Corinth. The barbarous treatment inflicted by Periander, in revenge for the death of his son, upon 300 Korkyræan youths, has already been recounted in a former chapter.[4] After the death of Periander, the island seems to have regained

[1] Herodot. iii. 49.

[2] Thucyd. i. 108; iii. 102.

[3] Thucyd. i. 13.

[4] Herodot. iii. 49—51; see above, chap. ix.

its independence, but we are left without any particulars respecting it from about 585 B.C. down to the period shortly preceding the invasion of Greece by Xerxês—nearly a century. At this later epoch the Korkyræans possessed a naval force hardly inferior to any state in Greece. The expulsion of the Kypselids from Corinth, and the re-establishment of the previous oligarchy or something like it, does not seem to have reconciled the Korkyræans to their mother-city. For it was immediately previous to the Peloponnesian war that the Corinthians preferred the bitterest complaints against them,[1] of setting at nought those obligations which a colony was generally understood to be obliged to render. No place of honour was reserved at the public festivals of Korkyra for Corinthian visitors, nor was it the practice to offer to the latter the first taste of the victims sacrificed —observances which were doubtless respectfully fulfilled at Ambrakia and Leukas. Nevertheless the Korkyræans had taken part conjointly with the Corinthians in favour of Syracuse, when that city was in imminent danger of being conquered and enslaved by Hippokratês[2] despot of Gela (about 492 B.C.)—an incident showing that they were not destitute of generous sympathy with sister states, and leading us to imagine that their alienation from Corinth was as much the fault of the mother-city as their own.

Relations with Epirus.

The grounds of the quarrel were, probably, jealousies of trade—especially trade with the Epirotic and Illyrian tribes, wherein both were to a great degree rivals. Safe at home and industrious in the culture of their fertile island, the Korkyræans were able to furnish wine and oil to the Epirots on the mainland, in exchange for the cattle, sheep, hides, and wool of the latter—more easily and cheaply than the Corinthian merchant. And for the purposes of this trade, they had possessed themselves of a Peræa or strip of the mainland immediately on the other side of the intervening strait, where they fortified various posts for the protection of their property.[3] The Corinthians were personally more popular among the Epirots than the Korkyræans;[4] but it was not until long after

[1] Thucyd. i. 25—37.
[2] Herodot. vii. 155.
[3] Thucyd. iii. 85. These fortifications are probably alluded to also i. 45—54. ἢ ἐς τῶν ἐκείνων χωρίων.
[4] Thucyd. i. 47.

the foundation of Korkyra that they established their first settlement on the mainland — Ambrakia, on the north side of the Ambrakiotic Gulf, near the mouth of the river Arachthus. It was during the reign of Kypselus, and under the guidance of his son Gorgus, that this settlement was planted, which afterwards became populous and considerable. We know nothing respecting its growth, and we hear only of a despot named Periander as ruling in it, probably related to the despot of the same name at Corinth.[1] Periander of Ambrakia was overthrown by a private conspiracy, provoked by his own brutality and warmly seconded by the citizens, who lived constantly afterwards under a popular government.[2]

Ambrakia founded by Corinth.

Notwithstanding the long-continued dissensions between Korkyra and Corinth, it appears that four considerable settlements on this same line of coast were formed by the joint enterprise of both—Leukas and Anaktorium, to the south of the mouth of the Ambrakiotic Gulf—and Apollonia and Epidamnus, both in the territory of the Illyrians, at some distance to the north of the Akrokeraunian promontory. In the settlement of the two latter, the Korkyræans seem to have been the principals—in that of the two former, they were only auxiliaries. It probably did not suit their policy to favour the establishment of any new colony on the intermediate coast opposite to their own island, between the promontory and the gulf above-mentioned. Leukas, Anaktorium, and Ambrakia are all referred to the agency of Kypselus the Corinthian. The tranquillity which Aristotle ascribes to his reign may be in part ascribed to the new homes thus provided for poor or discontented Corinthian citizens. Leukas was situated near the modern Santa Maura: the present island was originally a peninsula, and continued to be so until the time of Thucydidês; but in the succeeding half-century, the Leukadians cut through the isthmus, and erected a bridge across the narrow strait connecting them with the mainland. It had been once an Akarnanian settlement, named Epileukadii, the inhabitants of which, falling into civil dissension, invited 1000 Corinthian settlers to join them. The new-comers, choosing

Joint settlements by Corinth and Korkyra.

Leukas and Anaktorium.

[1] Strabo, vii. p. 325, x. p. 452: Skymn. Chi. 453: Hist. des Colon. Grecq. vol. iii. p. 294. Raoul Rochette,

[2] Aristot. Polit. v. 3, 5; v. 8, 9.

their opportunity for attack, slew or expelled those who had invited them, made themselves masters of the place with its lands, and converted it from an Akarnanian village into a Grecian town.[1] Anaktorium was situated a short distance within the mouth of the Ambrakian Gulf—founded, like Leukas, upon Akarnanian soil and with a mixture of Akarnanian inhabitants, by colonists under the auspices of Kypselus or Periander. In both these establishments Korkyræan settlers participated;[2] in both also, the usual religious feelings connected with Grecian emigration were displayed by the neighbourhood of a venerated temple of Apollo overlooking the sea—Apollo Aktius near Anaktorium, and Apollo Leukatas near Leukas.[3]

Between these three settlements—Ambrakia, Anaktorium, and Leukas—and the Akarnanian population of the interior, there were standing feelings of hostility; perhaps arising out of the violence which had marked the first foundation of Leukas. The Corinthians, though popular with the Epirots, had been indifferent or unsuccessful in conciliating the Akarnanians. It rather seems indeed that the Akarnanians were averse to the presence or neighbourhood of any powerful sea-port; for in spite of their hatred towards the Ambrakiots, they were more apprehensive of seeing Ambrakia in the hands of the Athenians than in that of its own native citizens.[4]

The two colonies north of the Akrokeraunian promontory, and

[1] About Leukas, see Strabo, x. p. 452; Skylax, p. 34; Steph. Byz. v. Ἐπιλευκάδιοι.

Strabo seems to ascribe the cutting through of the isthmus to the original colonists. But Thucydidês speaks of this isthmus in the plainest manner (iii. 81), and of the Corinthian ships of war as being transported across it. The Dioryktos, or intervening factitious canal, was always shallow, only deep enough for boats, so that ships of war had still to be carried across by hand or machinery (Polyb. v. 5): both Plutarch (De Serâ Num. Vind. p. 552) and Pliny treat Leukadia as having again become a peninsula, from the accumulation of sand (H. N. iv. 1): compare Livy, xxxiii. 17.

Mannert (Geograph. der Gr. und Röm., Part viii. b. 1, p. 72) accepts the statement of Strabo, and thinks that the Dioryktos had already been dug before the time of Thucydidês. But it seems more reasonable to suppose that Strabo was misinformed as to the date, and that the cut took place at some time between the age of Thucydidês and that of Skylax.

Boeckh (ad Corp. Inscriptt. Gr. t. i. p. 58) and W. C. Müller (De Corcyræor. Republicâ, Götting. 1835, p. 18) agree with Mannert.

[2] Skymn. Chius, 458; Thucyd. i. 55; Plutarch, Themistoklês, c. 24.

[3] Thucyd. i. 46; Strabo, x. p. 452. Before 220 B.C., the temple of Apollo Aktius, which in the time of Thucydidês belonged to Anaktorium, had come to belong to the Akarnanians: it seems also that the town itself had been merged in the Akarnanian league, for Polybius does not mention it separately (Polyb. iv. 63).

[4] Thucyd. iii. 94, 95, 115.

on the coast-land of the Illyrian tribes—Apollonia and Epidamnus—were formed chiefly by the Korkyræans, yet with some aid and a portion of the settlers from Corinth, as well as from other Doric towns. Especially it is to be noticed, that the œkist was a Corinthian and a Herakleid, Phalius the son of Eratokleidês—for according to the usual practice of Greece, whenever a city, itself a colony, founded a sub-colony, the œkist of the latter was borrowed from the mother-city of the former.[1] Hence the Corinthians acquired a partial right of control and interference in the affairs of Epidamnus, which we shall find hereafter leading to important practical consequences. Epidamnus (better known under its subsequent name Dyrrhachium) was situated on an isthmus on or near the territory of the Illyrian tribe called Taulantii, and is said to have been settled about 627 B.C. Apollonia, of which the god Apollo himself seems to have been recognised as œkist,[2] was founded under similar circumstances, during the reign of Periander of Corinth, on a maritime plain both extensive and fertile, near the river Aôus, two days' journey south of Epidamnus.

Apollonia and Epidamnus.

Both the one and the other of these two cities seem to have flourished, and to have received accession of inhabitants from Triphylia in Peloponnêsus, when that country was subdued by the Eleians. Respecting Epidamnus, especially, we are told that it acquired great wealth and population during the century preceding the Peloponnesian war.[3] A few allusions which we find in Aristotle, too brief to afford much instruction, lead us to suppose that the governments of both began by being close

[1] Thucyd. i. 24—26.

[2] The rhetor Aristeidês pays a similar compliment to Kyzikus, in his Panegyrical Address at that city—the god Apollo had founded it personally and directly himself, not through any human œkist, as was the case with other colonies (Aristeidês, Λόγος περὶ Κυζίκου, Or. xvi. p. 414: vol. i. p. 384, Dindorf).

[3] Thucyd. i. 24. ἐγένετο μεγάλη καὶ πολυάνθρωπος; Strabo, vii. p. 316, viii. p. 357; Steph. Byz. v. Ἀπολλωνία; Plutarch, De Serâ Numin. Vind. p. 553; Pausan. v. 22, 2.

Respecting the plain near the site of the ancient Apollonia, Colonel Leake observes: "The cultivation of this noble plain, capable of supplying grain to all Illyria and Epirus, with an abundance of other productions, is confined to a few patches of maize near the villages" (Travels in Northern Greece, vol. i. ch. vii. p. 367). Compare c. ii. p. 70.

The country surrounding Durazzo (the ancient Epidamnus) is described by another excellent observer as highly attractive, though now unhealthy. See the valuable topographical work, "Albanien, Rumelien, und die Oesterreichisch-montenegrinische Gränze, von Dr. Joseph Müller (Prag. 1844), p. 62.

oligarchies under the management of the primitive leaders of the colony—that in Epidamnus, the artisans and tradesmen in the town were considered in the light of slaves belonging to the public—but that in process of time (seemingly somewhat before the Peloponnesian war) intestine dissensions broke up this oligarchy,[1] substituted a periodical senate, with occasional public assemblies, in place of the permanent phylarchs or chiefs of tribes, and thus introduced a form more or less democratical, yet still retaining the original single-headed archon. The Epidamnian government was liberal in the admission of metics or resident aliens—a fact which renders it probable that the alleged public slavery of artizans in that town was a status carrying with it none of the hardships of actual slavery. It was through an authorised selling agent, or Polêtês, that all traffic between Epidamnus and the neighbouring Illyrians was carried on—individual dealing with them being interdicted.[2] Apollonia was in one respect pointedly distinguished from Epidamnus, since she excluded metics or resident strangers with a degree of rigour hardly inferior to Sparta. These few facts are all that we are permitted to hear respecting colonies both important in themselves and interesting as they brought the Greeks into connexion with distant people and regions.

The six colonies just named—Korkyra, Ambrakia, Anaktorium, Leukas, Apollonia, and Epidamnus—form an aggregate lying apart from the Hellenic name and connected with each other, though not always maintained in harmony, by analogy of race and position, as well as by their common original from Corinth. That the commerce which the Corinthian merchants carried on with them, and through them with the tribes in the interior, was lucrative, we can have no doubt; and Leukas and Ambrakia continued for a long time to be not merely faithful allies, but servile imitators of their mother-city. The commerce of Korkyra is also represented as very extensive, and carried even to the northern extremity of the Ionic Gulf. It would seem

Relations between these colonies.—Commerce.

[1] Thucyd. i. 25: Aristot. Polit. ii. 4, 13; iii. 11, 1; iv. 3, 8; v. 1, 6; v. 3, 4.
The allusions of the philosopher are so brief, as to convey little or no knowledge: see O. Müller, Dorians, b. iii. 9, 6; Tittmann, Griech. Staatsverfass. p. 491.

[2] Plutarch, Quæst. Græc. p. 297, c. 29; Ælian, V. H. xiii. 16.

that they were the first Greeks to open a trade and to establish various settlements on the Illyrian and Dalmatian coasts, as the Phokæans were the first to carry their traffic along the Adriatic coast of Italy. The jars and pottery of Korkyra enjoyed great reputation throughout all parts of the Gulf.[1] The general trade of the island, and the encouragement for its shipping, must probably have been greater during the sixth century B.C., while the cities of Magna Græcia were at the maximum of their prosperity, than in the ensuing century, when they had comparatively declined. Nor can we doubt that the visitors and presents to the oracle of Dôdôna in Epirus, which was distant two days' journey on landing from Korkyra, and the importance of which was most sensible during the earlier periods of Grecian history, contributed to swell the traffic of the Korkyræans.

It is worthy of notice that the monetary system established at Korkyra was thoroughly Grecian and Corinthian, graduated on the usual scale of obols, drachms, minæ, and talents, without including any of those native Italian or Sicilian elements which were adopted by the cities in Magna Græcia and Sicily. The type of the Corinthian coins seems also to have passed to those of Leukas and Ambrakia.[2]

Of the islands of Zakynthus and Kephallenia (Zante and Cephalonia) we hear very little; of Ithaka, so interesting from the story of the Odyssey, we have no historical information at all. The inhabitants of Zakynthus were Achæans from Peloponnêsus: Kephallenia was distributed among four separate city-governments.[3] Neither of these islands plays any part in Grecian history until the time of the maritime empire of Athens, after the Persian war.

[1] W. C. Müller, De Corcyræor. Repub. ch. 8, p. 60—62; Aristot. Mirab. Ausc. c. 104: Hesychius, v. Κερκυραῖοι ἀμφορεῖς; Herodot. i. 145.

The story given in the above passage of the Pseudo-Aristotle is to be taken in connexion with the succeeding chapter of the same work (105), wherein the statement (largely credited in antiquity) is given that the river Danube forked at a certain point of its course into two streams, one flowing into the Adriatic, the other into the Euxine.

[2] See the Inscriptions No. 1838 and No. 1845, in the collection of Boeckh, and Boeckh's Metrologie, vii. 8, p. 97. Respecting the Corinthian coinage our information is confused and imperfect.

[3] Thucyd. ii 30—66.

# CHAPTER XXIV.

## AKARNANIANS.—EPIROTS.

SOME notice must be taken of those barbarous or non-Hellenic nations who formed the immediate neighbours of Hellas, west of the range of Pindus, and north of that range which connects Pindus with Olympus—as well as of those other tribes who, though lying more remote from Hellas Proper, were yet brought into relations of traffic or hostility with the Hellenic colonies.

Between the Greeks and these foreign neighbours, the Akarnanians, of whom I have already spoken briefly in my preceding volume, form the proper link of transition. They occupied the territory between the river Achelôus, the Ionian Sea, and the Ambrakian Gulf: they were Greeks, and admitted as such to contend at the Pan-Hellenic games,[1] yet they were also closely connected with the Amphilochi and Agræi, who were not Greeks. In manners, sentiments, and intelligence, they were half-Hellenic and half-Epirotic—like the Ætolians and the Ozolian Lokrians. Even down to the time of Thucydidês, these nations were subdivided into numerous petty communities, lived in unfortified villages, were frequently in the habit of plundering each other, and never permitted themselves to be unarmed: in case of attack, they withdrew their families and their scanty stock, chiefly cattle, to the shelter of difficult mountains or marshes. They were for the most part light-armed, few among them being trained to the panoply of the Grecian hoplite; but they were both brave and skilful in their own mode of warfare, and the sling in the hands of the Akarnanian was a weapon of formidable efficiency.[2] Akarnanians.

[1] See Aristot. Fragm. περὶ Πολιτειῶν, πολιτεία. ed. Neumann; Fragm. 2, Ἀκαρνάνων

[2] Pollux, i. 150; Thucyd. ii. 81.

Notwithstanding this state of disunion and insecurity, however, the Akarnanians maintained a loose political league among themselves. A hill near the Amphilochian Argos, on the shores of the Ambrakian Gulf, had been fortified to serve as a judgment-seat or place of meeting for the settlement of disputes. And it seems that both Stratus and Œniadæ had become fortified in some measure towards the commencement of the Peloponnesian war. The former, the most considerable township in Akarnania, was situated on the Achelôus, rather high up its course—the latter was at the mouth of the river, and was rendered difficult of approach by its inundations.[1] Astakus, Solium, Palærus, and Alyzia lay on or near the coast of the Ionian Sea, between Œniadæ and Leukas: Plŷtia, Koronta, Medeôn, Limnæa, and Thyrium were between the southern shore of the Ambrakian Gulf and the river Achelôus.

Their social and political condition.

The Akarnanians appear to have produced many prophets. They traced up their mythical ancestry, as well as that of their neighbours the Amphilochians, to the most renowned prophetic family among the Grecian heroes—Amphiaraus, with his sons Alkmæôn and Amphilochus: Akarnan, the eponymous hero of the nation, and other eponymous heroes of the separate towns, were supposed to be the sons of Alkmæôn.[2] They are spoken of, together with the Ætolians, as mere rude shepherds by the lyric poet Alkman, and so they seem to have continued with little alteration until the beginning of the Peloponnesian war, when we hear of them, for the first time, as allies of Athens and as bitter enemies of the Corinthian colonies on their coast. The contact of those colonies, however, and the large spread of Akarnanian accessible coast, could not fail to produce some effect in socialising and improving the people. And it is probable that this effect would have been more sensibly felt, had not the Akarnanians been kept back by the fatal neighbourhood of the Ætolians, with whom they were in perpetual feud—a people the most unprincipled and un-

1 Thucyd. ii. 102; iii. 105.

2 Thucyd. ii. 68—102; Stephan. Byz. v. *Φοίτιαι*. See the discussion in Strabo (x. p. 462), whether the Akarnanians did, or did not, take part in the expedition against Troy; Ephorus maintaining the negative and stringing together a plausible narrative to explain *why* they did not. The time came when the Akarnanians gained credit with Rome for this supposed absence of their ancestors.

improvable of all who bore the Hellenic name, and whose habitual faithlessness stood in marked contrast with the rectitude and steadfastness of the Akarnanian character.[1] It was in order to strengthen the Akarnanians against these rapacious neighbours that the Macedonian Kassander urged them to consolidate their numerous small townships into a few considerable cities. Partially at least the recommendation was carried into effect, so as to aggrandise Stratus and one or two other towns. But in the succeeding century, the town of Leukas seems to lose its original position as a separate Corinthian colony, and to pass into that of chief city of Akarnania,[2] which it lost only by the sentence of the Roman conquerors.

Epirots—comprising different tribes, with little or no ethnical kindred.

Passing over the borders of Akarnania, we find small nations or tribes not considered as Greeks, but known, from the fourth century B.C. downwards, under the common name of Epirots. This word signifies properly inhabitants of a continent as opposed to those of an island or a peninsula. It came only gradually to be applied by the Greeks as their comprehensive denomination to designate all those diverse tribes, between the Ambrakian Gulf on the south and west, Pindus on the east, and the Illyrians and Macedonians to the north and north-east. Of these Epirots, the principal were—the Chaonians, Thesprotians, Kassôpians, and Molossians,[3] who occupied the country inland as well as maritime along the Ionian Sea from the Akrokeraunian mountains to the borders of Ambrakia in the interior of the Ambrakian Gulf. The Agræans and Amphilochians dwelt eastward of the last-mentioned gulf, bordering upon Akarnania: the Athamânes, the Tymphæans, and the Talares lived along the western skirts and high range of Pindus. Among these various tribes it is difficult to discriminate the semi-Hellenic from the non-Hellenic; for Herodotus considers both Molossians and Thesprotians as Hellenic—and the oracle of Dôdôna, as well as the Nekyomanteion (or holy cavern for evoking the dead) of Acherôn, were both in the territory of the Thesprotians, and both (in the time of the historian) Hellenic. Thucydidês, on the other hand, treats both Molossians and Thesprotians as barbaric, and Strabo says the

[1] Polyb. iv. 30: compare also ix. 40. 16—17; xlv. 31.
[2] Diodôr. xix. 67; Livy xxxiii. [3] Skylax, c. 28—32.

same respecting the Athamanes, whom Plato numbers as Hellenic.[1] As the Epirots were confounded with the Hellenic communities towards the south, so they become blended with the Macedonian and Illyrian tribes towards the north. The Macedonian Orestæ, north of the Cambunian mountains and east of Pindus, are called by Hekatæus a Molossian tribe; and Strabo even extends the designation Epirots to the Illyrian Paroræi and Atintânes, west of Pindus, nearly on the same parallel of latitude with the Orestæ.[2] It must be remembered (as observed above), that while the designations Illyrians and Macedonians are properly ethnical, given to denote analogies of language, habits, feeling, and supposed origin, and probably acknowledged by the people themselves—the name Epirots belongs to the Greek language, is given by Greeks alone, and marks nothing except residence on a particular portion of the continent. Theopompus (about 340 B.C.) reckoned fourteen distinct Epirotic nations, among whom the Molossians and Chaonians were the principal. It is possible that some of these may have been semi-Illyrian, others semi-Macedonian, though all were comprised by him under the common name Epirots.[3]

Some of these tribes ethnically connected with those of Southern Italy.

Of these various tribes, who dwelt between the Akrokeraunian promontory and the Ambrakian Gulf, some at least appear to have been of ethnical kindred with portions of the inhabitants of Southern Italy. There were Chaonians on the Gulf of Tarentum before the arrival of the Greek settlers, as well as in Epirus. Though we do not find the name Thesprotians in Italy, we find there a town named Pandosia and a river named Acherôn, the same as among the Epirotic Thesprotians: the ubiquitous name Pelasgian is connected both with one and with the other. This ethnical affinity, remote or near, between Œnotrians and Epirots,

[1] Herodot. ii. 56, v. 127; Thucyd. ii. 80; Plato, Minos, p. 315. The Chaonians and Thesprotians were separated by the river Thyamis (now Kalamas)—Thucyd. i. 46; Stephanus Byz. v. Τροία.

[2] Hekatæus, Fr. 77, ed. Klausen; Strabo, vii. p. 326; Appian, *Illyric.* c. 7. In the time of Thucydidês, the Molossi and the Atintânes were under the same king (ii. 80). The name Ἠπειρῶται, with Thucydidês, means only inhabitants of a continent—οἱ ταύτῃ ἠπειρῶται (i. 47; ii. 80) includes Ætolians and Akarnanians (iii. 94—95), and is applied to inhabitants of Thrace (iv. 105).

Epirus is used in its special sense to designate the territory west of Pindus, by Xenophôn, Hellen. vi. 1, 7.

Compare Mannert, Geographie der Griech. und Römer, part vii. book 2, p. 283.

[3] Strabo, vii. p. 324.

which we must accept as a fact without being able to follow it into detail, consists at the same time with the circumstance—that both seem to have been susceptible of Hellenic influences to an unusual degree, and to have been moulded, with comparatively little difficulty, into an imperfect Hellenism, like that of the Ætolians and Akarnanians. The Thesprotian conquerors of Thessaly passed in this manner into Thessalian Greeks. The Amphilochians who inhabited Argos on the Ambrakian Gulf were hellenised by the reception of Greeks from Ambrakia, though the Amphilochians situated without the city still remained barbarous in the time of Thucydidês:[1] a century afterwards, probably, they would be hellenised like the rest by a longer continuance of the same influences—as happened with the Sikels in Sicily.

Others, with the Macedonians—impossible to mark the boundaries.

To assign the names and exact boundaries of the different tribes inhabiting Epirus as they stood in the seventh and sixth centuries B.C., at the time when the western stream of Grecian colonisation was going on, and when the newly-established Ambrakiots must have been engaged in subjugating or expelling the prior occupants of their valuable site, is out of our power. We have no information prior to Herodotus and Thucydidês, and that which they tell us cannot be safely applied to a time either much earlier or much later than their own. That there was great analogy between the inland Macedonians and the Epirots, from Mount Bermius across the continent to the coast opposite Korkyra, in military equipment, in the fashion of cutting the hair, and in speech, we are apprised by a valuable passage of Strabo; who farther tells us that many of the tribes spoke two different languages[2]—a fact which at least proves very close intercommunion, if not a double origin and incorporation. Wars or voluntary secessions and new alliances would alter the boundaries and relative situation of the various tribes. And this would be the more easily effected, as all Epirus, even in the fourth century B.C., was parcelled out among an

[1] Thucyd. ii. 68.

[2] Strabo, vii. p. 324. In these same regions, under the Turkish government of the present day, such is the mixture and intercourse of Greeks, Albanians, Bulgaric Sclavonians, Wallachians, and Turks, that most of the natives find themselves under the necessity of acquiring two, sometimes three, languages: see Dr. Grisebach, Reise durch Rumelien und nach Brussa, ch. xii. vol. ii. p. 68.

aggregate of villages, without any great central cities: so that the severance of a village from the Molossian union, and its junction with the Thesprotian (abstracting from the feelings with which it might be connected), would make little practical difference in its condition or proceedings. The gradual increase of Hellenic influence tended partially to centralise this political dispersion, enlarging some of the villages into small towns by the incorporation of some of their neighbours; and in this way probably were formed the seventy Epirotic cities which were destroyed and given up to plunder on the same day, by Paulus Æmilius and the Roman senate. The Thesprotian Ephyrê is called a city even by Thucydidês.[1] Nevertheless the situation was unfavourable to the formation of considerable cities, either on the coast or in the interior, since the physical character of the territory is an exaggeration of that of Greece—almost throughout wild, rugged, and mountainous. The valleys and low grounds, though frequent, are never extensive—while the soil is rarely suited, in any continuous spaces, for the cultivation of corn; insomuch that the flour for the consumption of Janina, at the present day, is transported from Thessaly over the lofty ridge of Pindus by means of asses and mules;[2] while the fruits and vegetables are brought from Arta, the territory of Ambrakia. Epirus is essentially a pastoral country: its cattle as well as its shepherds and shepherd's dogs were celebrated throughout all antiquity; and its population then, as now, found divided village residence the most suitable to their means and occupations. In spite of this natural tendency, however, Hellenic influences were to a certain extent efficacious, and it is to them that we are to ascribe the formation of towns like Phœnikê—an inland city a few miles removed from the sea, in a latitude somewhat north of the northernmost point of Korkyra, which Polybius notices as the most flourishing[3] of the Epirotic cities at the time when it was plundered by the Illyrians in 230 B.C. Passarôn, the ancient spot where the

Territory distributed into villages—no considerable cities.

[1] Livy, xlv. 34; Thucyd. i. 47. Phanotê, in the more northerly part of Epirus, is called only a *castellum*, though it was an important military post (Livy, xliii. 21).

[2] Leake's Travels in Northern Greece, ch. xxxviii. vol. iv. pp. 207, 210, 233; ch. ix. vol. i. p. 411; Cyprien Robert, Les Slaves de Turquie, book iv. ch. 2. Βουβόται πρῶνες ἐξόχοι—Pindar, Nem. iv. 81; Cæsar, Bell. Civil. iii. 47.

[3] Polybius, ii. 5, 8

Molossian kings were accustomed on their accession to take their coronation-oath, had grown into a considerable town, in this last century before the Roman conquest; while Tekmôn, Phylakê, and Horreum also become known to us at the same period.[1] But the most important step which those kings made towards aggrandisement was the acquisition of the Greek city of Ambrakia, which became the capital of the kingdom of Pyrrhus, and thus gave to him the only site suitable for a concentrated population which the country afforded.

Coast of Epirus discouraging to Grecian colonisation.

If we follow the coast of Epirus from the entrance of the Ambrakian Gulf northward to the Akrokeraunian promontory, we shall find it discouraging to Grecian colonisation. There are none of those extensive maritime plains which the Gulf of Tarentum exhibits on its coast, and which sustained the grandeur of Sybaris and Krotôn. Throughout the whole extent, the mountain-region, abrupt and affording little cultivable soil, approaches near to the sea;[2] and the level ground, wherever it exists, must be commanded and possessed (as it is now) by villagers on hill-sites, always difficult of attack and often inexpugnable. From hence, and from the neighbourhood of Korkyra—herself well situated for traffic with Epirus, and jealous of neighbouring rivals—we may understand why the Grecian emigrants omitted this unprofitable tract, and passed on either northward to the maritime plains of Illyria, or westward to Italy. In the time of Herodotus and Thucydidês, there seems to have been no Hellenic settlement between Ambrakia and Apollonia. The harbour called Glykys Limên, with the neighbouring valley and plain the most considerable in Epirus next to that of Ambrakia, near the junction of the lake and river of Acherôn with the sea, were possessed by the Thesprotian town of Ephyrê, situated on a neighbouring eminence; perhaps also in part by the ancient Thesprotian town of Pandosia, so pointedly connected, both in Italy and Epirus, with the river Acherôn.[3] Amidst the almost

[1] Plutarch, Pyrrh. c. i.; Livy, xlv. 26.

[2] See the description of the geographical features of Epirus in Boué, La Turquie en Europe, Géographie Générale, vol. i. p. 57.

[3] See the account of this territory in Colonel Leake's Travels in Northern Greece, vol. i. ch. v.; his journey from Janina, through the district of Suli and the course of Acheron, to the plain of Glyky and the Acherusian lake and marshes near the sea. Compare also vol. iv. ch. xxxv. p. 73.

inexpugnable mountains and gorges which mark the course of that Thesprotian river, was situated the memorable recent community of Suli, which held in dependence many surrounding villages in the lower grounds and in the plain—the counterpart of primitive Epirotic rulers in situation, in fierceness, and in indolence, but far superior to them in energetic bravery and endurance. It appears that after the time of Thucydidês, certain Greek settlers must have found admission into the Epirotic towns in this region. For Demosthenês[1] mentions Pandosia, Buchetia, and Elæa as settlements from Elis, which Philip of Macedon conquered and handed over to his brother-in-law the king of the Molossian Epirots; and Strabo tells us that the name of Ephyrê had been changed to Kichyrus, which appears to imply an accession of new inhabitants.

Both the Chaonians and Thesprotians appear, in the time of Thucydidês, as having no kings: there was a privileged kingly race, but the presiding chief was changed from year to year.

Some Epirotic tribes governed by kings, others not.

The Molossians, however, had a line of kings, succeeding from father to son, which professed to trace its descent through fifteen generations downward, from Achilles and Neoptolemus to Tharypas about the year 400 B.C.: thus forming a scion of the great Æakid race. Admêtus, the Molossian king to whom Themistoklês presented himself as a suppliant, appears to have lived in the simplicity of an inland village chief. But Arrybas, his son or grandson, is said to have been educated at Athens, and to have introduced improved social regularity into his native country: while the subsequent kings both imitated the ambition and received the aid of Philip of Macedon, extending their dominion[2] over a large portion of the other Epirots. Even in the time of Skylax, they covered a large inland territory, though their portion of sea-coast

"To the ancient sites (observes Colonel Leake) which are so numerous in the great valleys watered by the Lower Acheron, the Lower Thyamis, and their tributaries, it is a mortifying disappointment to the geographer not to be able to apply a single name with absolute certainty."

The number of these sites affords one among many presumptions that each must have been individually inconsiderable.

[1] Demosthenês, De Haloneso, ch. 7, p. 84 R; Strabo, vii. p. 324.

[2] Skylax, c. 32; Pausanias, i. 11; Justin, xvii. 6.

That the *Arrhybas* of Justin is the same as the *Tharypas* of Pausanias—perhaps also the same as *Tharyps* in Thucydidês, who was a minor at the beginning of the Peloponnesian war—seems probable.

was confined. From the narrative of Thucydidês, we gather that all the Epirots, though held together by no political union, were yet willing enough to combine for purposes of aggression and plunder. The Chaonians enjoyed a higher military reputation than the rest. But the account which Thucydidês gives of their expedition against Akarnania exhibits a blind, reckless, boastful impetuosity, which contrasts strikingly with the methodical and orderly march of their Greek allies and companions.[1]

To collect the few particulars known, respecting these ruder communities adjacent to Greece, is a task indispensable for the just comprehension of the Grecian world, and for the appreciation of the Greeks themselves by comparison or contrast with their contemporaries. Indispensable as it is, however, it can hardly be rendered in itself interesting to the reader, whose patience I have to bespeak by assuring him that the facts hereafter to be recounted of Grecian history would be only half understood without this preliminary survey of the lands around.

[1] Thucyd. ii. 81.

# CHAPTER XXV.

## ILLYRIANS, MACEDONIANS, PÆONIANS.

NORTHWARD of the tribes called Epirotic lay those more numerous and widely extended tribes who bore the general name of Illyrians, bounded on the west by the Adriatic, on the east by the mountain-range of Skardus, the northern continuation of Pindus, and thus covering what is now called Middle and Upper Albania, together with the more northerly mountains of Montenegro, Herzegovina, and Bosnia. Their limits to the north and north-east cannot be assigned. But the Dardani and Autariatæ must have reached to the north-east of Skardus and even east of the Servian plain of Kossovo; while along the Adriatic coast, Skylax extends the race so far northward as to include Dalmatia, treating the Liburnians and Istrians beyond them as not Illyrian: yet Appian and others consider the Liburnians and Istrians as Illyrian, and Herodotus even includes under that name the Eneti or Veneti at the extremity of the Adriatic Gulf.[1]

Different tribes of Illyrians.

[1] Herod. i. 196; Skylax, c. 19—27; Appian, Illyric. c. 2, 4, 8.

The geography of the countries occupied in ancient times by the Illyrians, Macedonians, Pæonians, Thracians, &c., and now possessed by a great diversity of races, among whom the Turks and Albanians retain the primitive barbarism without mitigation, is still very imperfectly understood; though the researches of Colonel Leake, of Boué, of Grisebach, and others (especially the valuable travels of the latter), have of late thrown much light upon it. How much our knowledge is extended in this direction, may be seen by comparing the map prefixed to Mannert's Geographie, or to O. Müller's Dissertation on the Macedonians, with that in Boué's Travels; but the extreme deficiency of the maps, even as they now stand, is emphatically noticed by Boué himself (see his Critique des Cartes de la Turquie in the fourth volume of his Voyage)—by Paul Joseph Schaffarik, the learned historian of the Sclavonic race, in the preface attached by him to Dr Joseph Müller's Topographical Account of Albania—and by Grisebach, who, in his surveys taken from the summits of the mountains Peristeri and Ljubatrin, found the map differing at every step from the bearings which presented themselves to his eye. It is only since Boué and Grisebach that the idea has been completely dismissed, derived originally from Strabo, of a straight line of mountains (εὐθεῖα γραμμή, Strabo. lib.

The Bulini, according to Skylax, were the northernmost Illyrian tribe: the Amantini, immediately northward of the Epirotic Chaonians, were southernmost. Among the southern Illyrian tribes are to be numbered the Taulantii—originally the possessors,

vii. Fragm. 3) running across from the Adriatic to the Euxine, and sending forth other lateral chains in a direction nearly southerly. The mountains of Turkey in Europe, when examined with the stock of geological science which M. Viquesnel (the companion of Boué) and Dr. Grisebach bring to the task, are found to belong to systems very different, and to present evidences of conditions of formation often quite independent of each other.

The thirteenth chapter of Grisebach's Travels presents the best account which has yet been given of the chain of Skardus and Pindus: he has been the first to prove clearly that the Ljubatrin, which immediately overhangs the plain of Kossovo at the southern border of Servia and Bosnia, is the north-eastern extremity of a chain of mountains reaching southward to the frontiers of Ætolia, in a direction not very wide of N.-S.—with the single interruption (first brought to view by Colonel Leake) of the Klissoura of Devol—a complete gap, where the river Devol, rising on the eastern side, crosses the chain and joins the Apsus or Beratino on the western—(it is remarkable that both in the map of Boué and in that annexed to Dr. Joseph Müller's Topographical Description of Albania, the river Devol is made to join the Genussus or Skoumi considerably north of the Apsus, though Colonel Leake's map gives the correct course). In Grisebach's nomenclature Skardus is made to reach from the Ljubatrin as its north-eastern extremity, south-westward and southward as far as the Klissoura of Devol: south of that point Pindus commences, in a continuation, however, of the same axis.

In reference to the seats of the ancient Illyrians and Macedonians, Grisebach has made another observation of great importance (vol. ii. p. 121). Between the north-eastern extremity, Mount Ljubatrin, and the Klissoura of Devol, there are in the mighty and continuous chain of Skardus (above 7000 feet high) only two passes fit for an army to cross: one near the northern extremity of the chain, over which Grisebach himself crossed, from Kalkandele to Prisdren, a very high *col*, not less than 5000 feet above the level of the sea; the other, considerably to the southward, and lower as well as easier, nearly in the latitude of Lychnidus or Ochrida. It was over this last pass that the Roman Via Egnatia travelled, and that the modern road from Scutari and Durazzo to Bitolia now travels. With the exception of these two partial depressions, the long mountain ridge maintains itself undiminished in height, admitting indeed paths by which a small company either of travellers or of Albanian robbers from the Dibren, may cross (there is a path of this kind which connects Struga with Ueskiöub, mentioned by Dr. Joseph Müller, p. 70, and some others by Boué, vol. iv. p. 546), but nowhere admitting the passage of an army.

To attack the Macedonians, therefore, an Illyrian army would have to go through one or other of these passes, or else to go round the north eastern pass of Katschanik, beyond the extremity of Ljubatrin. And we shall find that, in point of fact, the military operations recorded between the two nations, carry us usually in one or other of these directions. The military proceedings of Brasidas (Thucyd. iv. 124) —of Philip the son of Amyntas king of Macedon (Diodôr. xvi. 8)—of Alexander the Great in the first year of his reign (Arrian, i. 5), all bring us to the pass near Lychnidus (compare Livy, xxxii. 9; Plutarch, *Flaminin.* c. 4); while the Illyrian Dardani and Autariatæ border upon Pæonia, to the north of Pelagonia, and threaten Macedonia from the north-east of the mountain-chain of Skardus. The Autariatæ are not far removed from the Pæonian Agrianes, who dwelt near the sources of the Strymôn, and both Autariatæ and Dardani threatened the return march of Alexander from the Danube into Macedonia, after his successful campaign against the Getæ, low down in the course of that great river (Arrian, i. 5). Without being able to determine the precise line of Alexander's march on this occasion, we may see that these

afterwards the immediate neighbours, of the territory on which Epidamnus was founded. The ancient geographer Hekatæus[1] (about 500 B.C.) is sufficiently well acquainted with them to specify their town Sesarêthus. He names the Chelidonii as their northern, the Encheleis as their southern, neighbours; and the Abri also as a tribe nearly adjoining. We hear of the Illyrian Parthini, nearly in the same regions—of the Dassaretii,[2] near Lake Lychnidus—of the Penestæ, with a fortified town Uscana, north of the Dassaretii—of the Ardiæans, the Autariatæ, and the Dardanians, throughout Upper Albania eastward as far as Upper Mœsia, including the range of Skardus itself; so that there were some Illyrian tribes conterminous on the east with Macedonians, and on the south with Macedonians as well as with Pæonians. Strabo even extends some of the Illyrian tribes much farther northward, nearly to the Julian Alps.[3]

With the exception of some portions of what is now called Middle Albania, the territory of these tribes consisted principally of mountain pastures with a certain proportion of fertile valley, but rarely expanding into a plain. The Autariatæ had the reputation of being unwarlike, but the Illyrians generally were poor, rapacious, fierce, and formidable in battle. They shared with the remote Thracian tribes the custom of tattooing[4] their

two Illyrian tribes must have come down to attack him from Upper Mœsia, and on the eastern side of the Axius. This, and the fact that the Dardani were the immediate neighbours of the Pæonians, shows us that their seats could not have been far removed from Upper Mœsia (Livy, xlv. 29): the fauces Pelagoniæ (Livy, xxxi. 34) are the pass by which they entered Macedonia from the north. Ptolemy even places the Dardani at Skopiæ (Ueskioub) (iii. 9); his information about these countries seems better than that of Strabo.

The important topographical instruction contained in Grisebach's work was deprived of much of its value from the want of a map annexed. This deficiency has now been supplied (1853) in the new map of Turkey in Europe, published by Kiepert of Berlin; wherein the data of Grisebach, Boué, Viquesnel, Joseph Müller, and several others are for the first time combined and turned to account. Kiepert's map is a material addition to our knowledge of the countries south of the Danube. The "Erläuterungen" annexed to it, while they set forth the best evidences on which a chartographer of Turkey in the present day can proceed, proclaim however the deplorable paucity of scientific or accurate observations.

[1] Hekatæi Fragm. ed. Klausen, Fr. 66—70; Thucyd. i. 26.

Skylax places the Encheleis north of Epidamnus and of the Taulantii. It may be remarked that Hekatæus seems to have communicated much information respecting the Adriatic: he noticed the city of Adria at the extremity of the Gulf, and the fertility and abundance of the territory around it (Fr. 58: compare Skymnus Chius, 384).

[2] Livy, xliii. 9—18. Mannert (Geograph. der Griech. und Römer, part vii. ch. 9, p. 386 *seq.*) collects the points and shows how little can be ascertained respecting the localities of these Illyrian tribes.

[3] Strabo, iv. p. 206.

[4] Strabo, vii. p. 315; Arrian, i. 5, 4–11. So impracticable is the territory,

bodies and of offering human sacrifices: moreover, they were always ready to sell their military service for hire, like the modern Albanian Schkipetars, in whom probably their blood yet flows, though with considerable admixture from subsequent immigrations. Of the Illyrian kingdom on the Adriatic coast, with Skodra (Scutari) for its capital city, which became formidable by its reckless piracies in the third century B.C., we hear nothing in the flourishing period of Grecian history. The description of Skylax notices in his day, all along the northern Adriatic, a considerable and standing traffic between the coast and the interior, carried on by Liburnians, Istrians, and the small Grecian insular settlements of Pharus and Issa. But he does not name Skodra, and probably this strong post (together with the Greek town Lissus, founded by Dionysius of Syracuse) was occupied after his time by conquerors from the interior,[1] the predecessors of Agrôn and Gentius, just as the coast-land of the Thermaic Gulf was conquered by inland Macedonians.

**Conflicts and contrast of Illyrians with Greeks.**

Once during the Peloponnesian war, a detachment of hired Illyrians, marching into Macedonia Lynkêstis (seemingly over the pass of Skardus a little east of Lychnidus or Ochrida), tried the valour of the Spartan Brasidas. On that occasion (as in the expedition above alluded to of the Epirots against Akarnania) we shall notice the marked superiority of the Grecian character, even in the case of an armament chiefly composed of helots newly enfranchised, over both Macedonians and Illyrians. We shall see the contrast between brave men acting in concert and obedience to a common authority, and an assailing host of warriors, not less brave individually, but in which every man is his own master,[2] and fights as he pleases.

and so narrow the means of the inhabitants, in the region called Upper Albania, that most of its resident tribes even now are considered as free, and pay no tribute to the Turkish government: the Pachas cannot extort it without greater expense and difficulty than the sum gained would repay. The same was the case in Epirus or Lower Albania, previous to the time of Ali Pacha: in Middle Albania, the country does not present the like difficulties, and no such exemptions are allowed (Boué, Voyage en Turquie, vol. iii. p. 192). These free Albanian tribes are in the same condition with regard to the Sultan as the Mysians and Pisidians in Asia Minor with regard to the king of Persia in ancient times (Xenophôn, Anab. iii. 2, 23).

[1] Diodôr. xv. 13; Polyb. ii. 4.

[2] See the description in Thucydidês (iv. 124—128); especially the exhortation which he puts into the mouth of Brasidas αὐτοκράτωρ μάχῃ, contrasted with the orderly array of Greeks.

"Illyriorum velocitas ad excursiones et impetus subitos."—Livy, xxxi. 35.

The rapid and impetuous rush of the Illyrians, if the first shock failed of its effect, was succeeded by an equally rapid retreat or flight. We hear nothing afterwards respecting these barbarians until the time of Philip of Macedon, whose vigour and military energy first repressed their incursions and afterwards partially conquered them. It seems to have been about this period (400—350 B.C.) that the great movement of the Gauls from west to east took place, which brought the Gallic Skordiski and other tribes into the regions between the Danube and the Adriatic Sea, and which probably dislodged some of the northern Illyrians so as to drive them upon new enterprises and fresh abodes.

What is now called *Middle Albania*, the Illyrian territory immediately north of Epirus, is much superior to the latter in productiveness.[1] Though mountainous, it possesses more both of low hill and valley, and ampler as well as more fertile cultivable spaces. Epidamnus and Apollonia formed the seaports of this territory. To them commerce with the southern Illyrians, less barbarous than the northern, was one of the sources[2] of great prosperity during the first century of their existence—a prosperity interrupted in the case of the Epidamnians by internal dissensions, which impaired their ascendency over their Illyrian neighbours, and ultimately placed them at variance with their mother-city Korkyra. The commerce between these Greek seaports and the interior tribes, when once the Greeks became strong enough to render violent attack from the latter hopeless, was reciprocally beneficial to both of them. Grecian oil and wine were introduced among these barbarians, whose chiefs at the same time learnt to appreciate the woven fabrics,[3] the polished and carved metallic work, the tempered weapons, and the pottery, which issued from Grecian artisans. Moreover the importation sometimes of salt-fish, and always that of salt itself, was of the greatest importance to these inland residents, especially for such localities as possessed

Epidamnus and Apollonia in relation to the Illyrians.

[1] See Pouqueville, Voyage en Grèce, vol. i. ch. 23 and 24; Grisebach, Reise durch Rumelien und nach Brussa, vol. ii. p. 138, 139; Boué, La Turquie en Europe, Géographie Générale, vol. i. p. 60—65.

[2] Skymnus Chius, v. 418—425.

[3] Thucydidês mentions the ὑφαντὰ καὶ λεῖα, καὶ ἡ ἄλλη κατασκευὴ which the Greek settlements on the Thracian coast sent up to king Seuthês (ii. 98): similar to the ὑφάσματ' ἱερά, and to the χειραρὰν τεκτόνων δαίδαλα, offered as presents to the Delphian god (Eurip. Ion, 1141; Pindar, Pyth. v. 46).

lakes abounding in fish like that of Lychnidus. We hear of wars between the Autariatæ and the Ardiæi, respecting salt-springs near their boundaries, and also of other tribes whom the privation of salt reduced to the necessity of submitting to the Romans.[1] On the other hand these tribes possessed two articles of exchange so precious in the eyes of the Greeks, that Polybius reckons them as absolutely indispensable[2]—cattle and slaves; which latter were doubtless procured from Illyria, often in exchange for salt, as they were from Thrace and from the Euxine, and from Aquileia

[1] Strabo, vii. p. 317; Appian, Illyric. 17; Aristot. Mirab. Ausc. c. 138. For the extreme importance of the trade in salt, as a bond of connexion, see the regulations of the Romans when they divided Macedonia into four provinces, with the distinct view of cutting off all connexion between one and the other. *All commercium* and *connubium* were forbidden between them. The fourth region, whose capital was Pelagonia (and which included all the primitive or Upper Macedonia, east of the range of Pindus and Skardus), was altogether inland, and it was expressly forbidden to draw its salt from the third region, or the country between the Lower Axius and the Peneius; while on the other hand the Illyrian Dardani (situated northward of Upper Macedonia) received express permission to draw *their* salt from this third or maritime region of Macedonia: the salt was to be conveyed from the Thermaic Gulf along the road of the Axius to Stobi in Pæonia, and was there to be sold at a fixed price.

The inner or fourth region of Macedonia, which included the modern Bitoglia and Lake Castoria, could easily obtain its salt from the Adriatic by the communication afterwards so well known as the Roman Egnatian way; but the communication of the Dardani with the Adriatic led through a country of the greatest possible difficulty, and it was probably a great convenience to them to receive their supply from the Gulf of Therma by the road along the Vardar (Axius) (Livy, xlv. 29). Compare the route of Grisebach from Salonichi to Scutari, in his Reise durch Rumelien, vol. ii.

[2] About the cattle in Illyria, Aristotle, De Mirab. Ausc. c. 128. There is a remarkable passage in Polybius, wherein he treats the importation of slaves as a matter of necessity to Greece (iv. 37). The purchasing of the Thracian slaves in exchange for salt is noticed by Menander—Θρᾴξ εὐγενὴς εἶ, πρὸς ἅλας ἠγορασμένος; see Proverb. Zenob. ii. 12, and Diogenian, i. 100.

The same trade was carried on in antiquity with the nations on and near Caucasus, from the seaport of Dioskurias at the eastern extremity of the Euxine (Strabo, xi. p. 506); so little have those tribes changed, that the Circassians now carry on much the same trade. Dr. Clarke's statement carries us back to the ancient world:—"The Circassians frequently sell their children to strangers, particularly to the Persians and Turks, and their princes supply the Turkish seraglios with the most beautiful of the prisoners of both sexes whom they take in war. In their commerce with the Tchernomorski Cossacks (north of the river Kuban), the Circassians bring considerable quantities of wood, and the delicious honey of the mountains, sewed up in goats' hides, with the hair on the outside. These articles they exchange for salt, a commodity found in the neighbouring lakes, of a very excellent quality. Salt is more precious than any other kind of wealth to the Circassians, and it constitutes the most acceptable present which can be offered to them. They weave mats of very great beauty, which find a ready market both in Turkey and Russia. They are also ingenious in the art of working silver and other metals, and in the fabrication of guns, pistols, and sabres. Some which they offered us for sale, we suspected had been procured in Turkey in exchange for slaves. Their bows and arrows are made with inimitable skill, and the arrows being tipped with iron, and otherwise exquisitely wrought, are considered by the Cossacks and Russians as inflicting incurable wounds." (Clarke's Travels, vol. i. ch. xvi. p. 378.)

in the Adriatic, through the internal wars of one tribe with another. Silver mines were worked at Damastium in Illyria. Wax and honey were probably also articles of export, and it is a proof that the natural products of Illyria were carefully sought out, when we find a species of iris peculiar to the country collected and sent to Corinth, where its root was employed to give the special flavour to a celebrated kind of aromatic unguent.[1]

The intercourse between the Hellenic ports and the Illyrians inland was not exclusively commercial. Grecian exiles also found their way into Illyria, and Grecian mythes became localised there, as may be seen by the tale of Kadmus and Harmonia, from whom the chiefs of the Illyrian Encheleis professed to trace their descent.[2]

Early Macedonians.

The Macedonians of the fourth century B.C. acquired, from the ability and enterprise of two successive kings, a great perfection in Greek military organization without any of the loftier Hellenic qualities. Their career in Greece is purely destructive, extinguishing the free movement of the separate cities, and disarming the citizen-soldier to make room for the foreign mercenary whose sword was unhallowed by any feelings of patriotism—yet totally incompetent to substitute any good system of central or pacific administration. But the Macedonians of the seventh and sixth centuries B.C. are an aggregate only of rude inland tribes, subdivided into distinct petty principalities, and separated from the Greeks by a wider ethnical difference even than the Epirots; since Herodotus, who considers the Epirotic Molossians and Thesprotians as children of Hellên, decidedly thinks the contrary respecting the Macedonians.[3] In the main, however, they seem at this early period analogous to the Epirots in character and civilization. They had some few towns, but they were chiefly village residents, extremely brave and pugnacious: the customs of some of their tribes enjoined

[1] Theophrast. Hist. Plant. iv. 5, 2; ix. 7, 4; Pliny, H. N. xiii. 2; xxi. 19; Strabo, vii. p. 326. Coins of Epidamnus and Apollonia are found not only in Macedonia, but in Thrace and in Italy: the trade of these two cities probably extended across from sea to sea, even before the construction of the Egnatian way; and the Inscription 2056 in the Corpus of Boeckh proclaims the gratitude of Odêssus (Varna) in the Euxine Sea towards a citizen of Epidamnus (Barth, Corinthiorum Mercatur. Hist. p. 49; Aristot. Mirab. Auscult. c. 104).

[2] Herodot. v. 61; viii. 137 Strabo, vii. p. 326. Skylax places the λίθοι of Kadmus and Harmonia among the Illyrian Manii, north of the Encheleis (Diodôr. xix. 53; Pausan. ix. 5, 3).

[3] Herodot. v. 22.

that the man who had not yet slain an enemy should be distinguished on some occasions by a badge of discredit.[1]

The original seats of the Macedonians were in the regions east of the chain of Skardus (the northerly continuation of Pindus)—north of the chain called the Cambunian mountains, which connects Olympus with Pindus, and which forms the north-western boundary of Thessaly; but they did not reach so far eastward as the Thermaic Gulf; apparently not farther eastward than Mount Bermius, or about the longitude of Edessa and Berrhoia. They thus covered the upper portions of the course of the rivers Haliakmôn and Erigôn, before the junction of the latter with the Axius; while the upper course of the Axius, higher than this point of junction, appears to have belonged to Pæonia, though the boundaries of Macedonia and Pæonia cannot be distinctly marked out at any time. Their original seats.

The large space of country included between the above-mentioned boundaries is in great part mountainous, occupied by lateral ridges or elevations which connect themselves with the main line of Skardus. But it also comprises three wide alluvial basins or plains, which are of great extent and well adapted to cultivation—the plain of Tettovo or Kalkandele (northernmost of the three), which contains the sources and early course of the Axius or Vardar—that of Bitolia, coinciding to a great degree with the ancient Pelagonia, wherein the Erigôn flows towards the Axius—and the larger and more undulating basin of Greveno and Anaselitzas, containing the Upper Haliakmôn with its confluent streams: this latter region is separated from the basin of Thessaly by a mountainous line of considerable length, but presenting numerous easy passes.[2] Reckoning the basin of Thessaly as a fourth, here are four distinct enclosed plains on the east side of this long range of Skardus and Pindus—each generally bounded by mountains which rise precipitously to an alpine height, and each leaving only one cleft for drainage by a single river—the Axius, the Erigôn, the Haliakmôn, and the Peneius respectively. General view of the country which they occupied—eastward of Pindus and Skardus.

[1] Aristot. Polit. vii. 2, 6. That the Macedonians were chiefly village residents appears from Thucyd. ii. 100, iv. 124, though this does not exclude *some* towns.

[2] Boué, Voyage en Turquie, vol. i. p. 199: "un bon nombre de cols dirigés du nord au sud, comme pour inviter les habitants de passer d'une de ces provinces dans l'autre"

All four, moreover, though of high level above the sea, are yet for the most part of distinguished fertility, especially the plains of Tettovo, of Bitolia, and Thessaly. The fat rich land to the east of Pindus and Skardus is described as forming a marked contrast with the light calcareous soil of the Albanian plains and valleys on the western side. The basins of Bitolia and of the Haliakmôn, with the mountains around and adjoining, were possessed by the original Macedonians; that of Tettovo, on the north, by a portion of the Pæonians. Among the four, Thessaly is the most spacious; yet the two comprised in the primitive seats of the Macedonians, both of them very considerable in magnitude, formed a territory better calculated to nourish and to generate a considerable population than the less favoured home, and smaller breadth of valley and plain, occupied by Epirots or Illyrians. Abundance of corn easily raised, of pasture for cattle, and of new fertile land open to cultivation, would suffice to increase the numbers of hardy villagers, indifferent to luxury as well as to accumulation, and exempt from that oppressive extortion of rulers which now harasses the same fine regions.[1]

[1] For the general physical character of the region, both east and west of Skardus, continued by Pindus, see the valuable chapter of Grisebach's Travels above referred to (Reisen, vol. ii. ch. viii. p. 125—130; c. xiv. p. 175; c. xvi. p. 214—216; c. xvii. p. 244, 245).

Respecting the plains comprised in the ancient Pelagonia, see also the Journal of the younger Pouqueville, in his progress from Travnik in Bosnia to Janina. He remarks, in the two days' march from Prelepe (Prilip) through Bitolia to Florina, "Dans cette route on parcourt des plaines luxuriantes couvertes de moissons, de vastes prairies remplies de trèfle, des plateaux abondans en pâturages inépuisables, où paissent d'innombrables troupeaux de bœufs, de chèvres, et de menu bétail . . . Le blé, le maïs, et les autres grains sont toujours à très bas prix, à cause de la difficulté des débouchés, d'où l'on exporte une grande quantité de laines, de cotons, de peaux d'agneaux, de buffles, et de chevaux, qui passent par le moyen des caravanes en Hongrie." (Pouqueville, Voyage dans la Grèce, tom. ii. ch. 62, p. 495.) So also Grisebach, describing his journey from Bitolia to Prilip, mentions—"spacious fields, of immeasurable extent, covered with wheat, barley, and maize, together with rich meadows and pasture-grounds bordering the water" (p. 214).

Again, M. Boué remarks upon this same plain, in his Critique des Cartes de la Turquie, Voyage, vol. iv. p. 483, "La plaine immense de Prilip, de Bitolia, et de Florina, n'est pas représentée (sur les cartes) de manière à ce qu'on ait une idée de son étendue, et surtout de sa largeur . . . . La plaine de Sarigoul est changée en vallée," &c. The basin of the Haliakmôn he remarks to be represented equally imperfectly on the maps: compare also his Voyage, i. pp. 211, 299, 300.

I notice more particularly the large proportion of fertile plain and valley in the ancient Macedonia, because it is often represented (and even by O. Müller, in his Dissertation on the ancient Macedonians, attached to his History of the Dorians) as a cold and rugged land, pursuant to the statement of Livy (xlv. 30), who says, respecting the fourth region of Macedonia as distributed by the Romans, "Frigida hæc omnis, duraque cultu, et aspera plaga est: cultorum quoque ingenia terræ similia habet: ferociores eos et accolæ barbari faciunt, nunc

Distribution and tribes of the Macedonians.

The inhabitants of this primitive Macedonia doubtless differed much in ancient times, as they do now, according as they dwelt on mountain or plain, and in soil and climate more or less kind. But all acknowledged a common ethnical name and nationality, and the tribes were in many cases distinguished from each other, not by having substantive names of their own, but merely by local epithets of Grecian origin. Thus we find Elymiotæ Macedonians or Macedonians of Elymeia—Lynkêstæ Macedonians or Macedonians of Lynkus, &c. Orestæ is doubtless an adjunct name of the same character. The inhabitants of the more northerly tracts, called Pelagonia and Deuriopus, were also portions of the Macedonian aggregate, though neighbours of the Pæonians, to whom they bore much affinity: whether the Eordi and Almopians were of Macedonian race, it is more difficult to say. The Macedonian language was different from Illyrian,[1] from Thracian, and seemingly also from Pæonian; it was also different from Greek, yet apparently not more widely distinct than that of the Epirots; so that the acquisition of Greek was comparatively easy to the chiefs and people, though there were always some Greek letters which they were incapable of pronouncing. And when we follow their history, we shall find in them more of the regular warrior conquering in order to maintain dominion and tribute, and less of the armed plunderer, than the Illyrians, Thracians, or Epirots, by whom it was their misfortune to be surrounded. They approach nearer to the Thessalians,[2] and to the other ungifted members of the Hellenic family.

The large and comparatively productive region covered by the various sections of Macedonians helps to explain that increase of ascendency which they successively acquired over all their

bello exercentes, nunc in pace miscentes ritus suos".

This is probably true of the mountaineers included in the region, but it is too much generalised.

[1] Polyb. xxviii 8, 9. This is the most distinct testimony which we possess, and it appears to me to contradict the opinion both of Mannert (Geogr. der Gr. und Röm. vol. vii. p. 492) and of O. Müller (On the Macedonians, sect. 28—36), that the native Macedonians were of Illyrian descent.

[2] The Macedonian military array seems to have been very like that of the Thessalians—horsemen well-mounted and armed and maintaining good order (Thucyd. ii. 201): of their infantry, before the time of Philip son of Amyntas, we do not much hear.

"Macedoniam, quæ tantis barbarorum gentibus attingitur, ut semper Macedonicis imperatoribus fidem fines imperii fuerint qui gladiorum atque pilorum." (Cicero, in Pison. c. xvi.)

neighbours. It was not however until a late period that they became united under one government. At first, each section—how many we do not know—had its own prince or chief. The Elymiots or inhabitants of Elymeia, the southernmost portion of Macedonia, were thus originally distinct and independent; also the Orestæ, in mountain seats somewhat north-west of the Elymiots—the Lynkêstæ and Eordi, who occupied portions of territory on the track of the subsequent Egnatian way, between Lychnidus (Ochrida) and Edessa—the Pelagonians,[1] with a town of the same name, in the fertile plain of Bitolia—and the more northerly Deuriopians. And the early political union was usually so loose, that each of these denominations probably includes many petty independencies, small towns, and villages.

Macedonians round Edessa—the leading portion of the nation.

The section of the Macedonian name who afterwards swallowed up all the rest and became known as *The Macedonians*, had their original centre at Ægæ or Edessa—the lofty, commanding, and picturesque site of the modern Vodhena. And though the residence of the kings was in later times transferred to the marshy Pella, in the maritime plain beneath, yet Edessa was always retained as the regal burial place, and as the hearth to which the religious continuity of the nation (so much reverenced in ancient times) was attached. This ancient town, which lay on the Roman Egnatian way from Lychnidus to Pella and Thessalonika, formed the pass over the mountain-ridge called Bermius, or that prolongation to the northward of Mount Olympus, through which the Haliakmôn makes its way out into the maritime plain at Verria, by a cleft more precipitous and impracticable than that of the Peneius in the defile of Tempê.

Pierians and Bottiæans—originally placed on the Thermaic Gulf, between the Macedonians and the sea.

This mountain-chain called Bermius, extending from Olympus considerably to the north of Edessa, formed the original eastern boundary of the Macedonian tribes; who seem at first not to have reached the valley of the Axius in any part of its course, and who certainly did not reach at first to the Thermaic Gulf. Between the last-mentioned gulf and the eastern counterforts of Olympus and Bermius there exists a narrow strip of plain land or low hill which reaches from the

[1] Strabo, lib. vii. Fragm. 20, ed. Tafel.

mouth of the Peneius to the head of the Thermaic Gulf; it there widens into the spacious and fertile plain of Salonichi, comprising the mouths of the Haliakmôn, the Axius, and the Echeidôrus. The river Ludias, which flows from Edessa into the marshes surrounding Pella, and which in antiquity joined the Haliakmôn, near its mouth, has now altered its course so as to join the Axius. This narrow strip, between the mouths of the Peneius and the Haliakmôn, was the original abode of the Pierian Thracians, who dwelt close to the foot of Olympus, and among whom the worship of the Muses seems to have been a primitive characteristic; Grecian poetry teems with local allusions and epithets which appear traceable to this early fact, though we are unable to follow it in detail. North of the Pierians, from the mouth of the Haliakmôn to that of the Axius, dwelt the Bottiæans.[1] Beyond the river Axius, at the lower part

[1] I have followed Herodotus in stating the original series of occupants on the Thermaic Gulf, anterior to the Macedonian conquests. Thucydidês introduces the Pæonians between Bottiæans and Mygdonians: he says that the Pæonians possessed "a narrow strip of land on the side of the Axius, down to Pella and the sea" (ii. 99). If this were true, it would leave hardly any room for the Bottiæans, whom nevertheless Thucydidês recognises on the coast; for the whole space between the mouths of the two rivers, Axius and Haliakmôn, is inconsiderable; moreover, I cannot but suspect that Thucydidês has been led to believe, by finding in the Iliad that the Pæonian allies of Troy came from the Axius, that there *must have been* old Pæonian settlements at the mouth of that river, and that he has advanced the inference as if it were a certified fact. The case is analogous to what he says about the Bœotians in his preface (upon which O. Müller has already commented); he stated the immigration of the Bœotians into Bœotia as having taken place *after* the Trojan war, but saves the historical credit of the Homeric catalogue by adding that there had been *a fraction* of them in Bœotia *before*, from whom the contingent which went to Troy was furnished (ἀποδασμός, Thucyd. i. 12).

On this occasion, therefore, having to choose between Herodotus and Thucydidês, I prefer the former. O. Müller (On the Macedonians, sect. 11) would strike out just so much of the assertion of Thucydidês as positively contradicts Herodotus, and retain the rest; he thinks that the Pæonians came down *very near* to the mouth of the river, but *not quite*. I confess that this does not satisfy me; the more so as the passage from Livy by which he would support his view will appear, on examination, to refer to Pæonia high up the Axius—not to a supposed portion of Pæonia near the mouth (Livy, xlv. 29).

Again, I would remark that the original residence of the Pierians between the Peneius and the Haliakmôn rests chiefly upon the authority of Thucydidês: Herodotus knows the Pierians in their seats between Mount Pangæus and the sea, but he gives no intimation that they had before dwelt south of the Haliakmôn; the tract between the Haliakmôn and the Peneius is by him conceived as Lower Macedonia or Macedonis, reaching to the borders of Thessaly (vii. 127—173). I make this remark in reference to sect. 7—17 of O. Müller's Dissertation, wherein the conception of Herodotus appears incorrectly apprehended, and some erroneous inferences founded upon it. That this tract was the original Pieria, there is sufficient reason for believing (compare Strabo, vii. Frag. 22, with Tafel's note, and ix. p. 410; Livy, xliv. 9); but Herodotus notices it only as Macedonia.

of its course, began the tribes of the great Thracian race—Mygdonians, Krestônians, Edônians, Bisaltæ, Sithonians: the Mygdonians seem to have been originally the most powerful, since the country still continued to be called by their name, Mygdonia, even after the Macedonian conquest. These, and various other Thracian tribes, originally occupied most part of the country between the mouth of the Axius and that of the Strymôn; together with that memorable three-pronged peninsula which derived from the Grecian colonies its name of Chalkidikê. It will thus appear, if we consider the Bottiæans as well as the Pierians to be Thracians, that the Thracian race extended originally southward as far as the mouth of the Peneius: the Bottiæans professed indeed a Kretan origin, but this pretension is not noticed by either Herodotus or Thucydidês. In the time of Skylax,[1] seemingly during the early reign of Philip the son of Amyntas, Macedonia and Thrace were separated by the Strymôn.

*Pæonians.*

We have yet to mention the Pæonians, a numerous and much-divided race, seemingly neither Thracian nor Macedonian nor Illyrian, but professing to be descended from the Teukri of Troy. These Pæonians occupied both banks of the Strymôn, from the neighbourhood of Mount Skomius, in which that river rises,[2] down to the lake near its mouth: some of their tribes possessed the fertile plain of Siris (now Seres)—the land immediately north of Mount Pangæus—and even a portion of the space through which Xerxês marched on his route from Akanthus to Therma. Besides this, it appears that the upper parts of the valley of the Axius were also occupied by Pæonian tribes; how far down the river they extended we are unable to say. We are not to suppose that the whole territory between Axius and Strymôn was continuously peopled by them. Continuous population is not the character of the ancient world, and it seems moreover that while the land immediately bordering on both rivers is in very many places of the richest quality, the spaces between the two are either mountain or barren low hill—

[1] Skylax, c. 67. The conquests of Philip extended the boundary beyond the Strymôn to the Nestus (Strabo, lib. vii. Fragm. 33, ed. Tafel).

[2] Mount Skomius seems to be the mountain now called Vitoshka, between Kadomir and Sophia, near the south-eastern frontier of Servia (Thucyd. ii. 96; Grisebach, vol. ii. ch. x. p. 29).

forming a marked contrast with the rich alluvial basin of the Macedonian river Erigôn.[1] The Pæonians in their north-western tribes thus bordered upon the Macedonian Pelagonia—in their northern tribes, upon the Illyrian Dardani and Autariatæ—in their eastern, southern, and south-eastern tribes, upon the Thracians and Pierians;[2] that is, upon the second seats occupied by the expelled Pierians under Mount Pangæus.

Such was, as far as we can make it out, the position of the Macedonians and their immediate neighbours, in the seventh century B.C. It was first altered by the enterprise and ability of a family of exiled Greeks, who conducted a section of the Macedonian people to those conquests which their descendants, Philip and Alexander the Great, afterwards so marvellously multiplied.

Argeian Greeks who established the dynasty of Edessa—Perdikkas.

Respecting the primitive ancestry of these two princes, there were different stories, but all concurred in tracing the origin of the family to the Herakleid or Temenid race of Argos. According to one story (which apparently cannot be traced higher than Theopompus), Karanus, brother of the despot Pheidôn, had migrated from Argos to Macedonia, and established himself as conqueror at Edessa. According to another tale, which we find in Herodotus, there were three exiles of the Temenid race, Gauanês, Aëropus, and Perdikkas, who fled from Argos to Illyria, from whence they passed into Upper Macedonia, in such poverty as to be compelled to serve the petty king of the town Lebæa in the capacity of shepherds. A remarkable prodigy happening to Perdikkas foreshadows the future eminence of his family, and leads to his dismissal by the king of Lebæa—from whom he makes his escape with difficulty. He is preserved by the sudden

[1] See this contrast noticed in Grisebach, especially in reference to the wide but barren region called the plain of Mustapha, no great distance from the left bank of the Axius (Grisebach, Reisen, v. ii. p. 225; Boué, Voyage, vol. i. p. 168).

For the description of the banks of the Axius (Vardar) and the Strymôn, see Leake, Travels in Northern Greece, vol. iii. p. 201, and Boué, Voyage en Turquie, vol. i. p. 196—199. "La plaine ovale de Seres est un des diamans de la couronne de Byzance," &c. He remarks how incorrectly the course of the Strymôn is depicted on the maps (vol. iv. p. 482).

[2] The expression of Strabo or his Epitomator—*τὴν Παιονίαν μέχρι Πελαγονίας καὶ Πιερίας ἐκτετάσθαι*—seems quite exact, though Tafel finds a difficulty in it. See his note on the Vatican Fragments of the seventh Book of Strabo, Fr. 37. The Fragment 40 is expressed much more loosely. Compare Herodot. v. 13—16, vii. 124; Thucyd. ii. 96; Diodôr. xx. 19.

rise of a river, immediately after he had crossed it, so as to become impassable by the horsemen who pursued him; to this river, as to the saviour of the family, solemn sacrifices were still offered by the kings of Macedonia in the time of Herodotus. Perdikkas with his two brothers, having thus escaped, established himself near the spot called the Garden of Midas on Mount Bermius. From the loins of this hardy young shepherd sprang the dynasty of Edessa.[1] This tale bears much more the marks of a genuine local tradition than that of Theopompus; and the origin of the Macedonian family, or Argeadæ, from Argos, appears to have been universally recognised by Grecian inquirers,[2] so that Alexander the son of Amyntas, the contemporary of the Persian invasion, was admitted by the Hellanodikæ to contend at the Olympic games as a genuine Greek, though his competitors sought to exclude him as a Macedonian.

Talents for command manifested by Greek chieftains over barbaric tribes.

The talent for command was so much more the attribute of the Greek mind than of any of the neighbouring barbarians, that we easily conceive a courageous Argeian adventurer acquiring to himself great ascendency in the local disputes of the Macedonian tribes, and transmitting the chieftainship of one of those tribes to his offspring. The influence acquired by Miltiadês among the Thracians of the Chersonese, and by Phormio among the Akarnanians (who specially requested that after his death his son or some one of his kindred might be sent from Athens to command them[3]), was very much of this character. We may add the case of Sertorius among the native Iberians. In like manner, the kings of the Macedonian Lynkêstæ professed to be descended from the Bacchiadæ[4] of Corinth; and the neighbourhood of Epidamnus and Apollonia, in both of which doubtless members of that great gens were domiciliated, renders this tale even more plausible than that of an emigration from Argos. The kings of the Epirotic Molossi pretended also to a descent from the heroic Æakid race of Greece. In fact, our means of knowledge do not enable us to discriminate

[1] Herodot. viii. 137, 138.

[2] Herodot. v. 22. Argeadæ, Strabo, lib. vii. Fragm. 20, ed. Tafel, which may probably have been erroneously changed into Ægeadæ (Justin, vii. 1).

[3] Thucyd. iii. 7; Herodot. vi. 34—37: compare the story of Zalmoxis among the Thracians (i. 94).

[4] Strabo, vii p. 326.

the cases in which these reigning families were originally Greeks from those in which they were Hellenised natives pretending to Grecian blood.

After the foundation-legend of the Macedonian kingdom, we have nothing but a long blank until the reign of king Amyntas (about 520—500 B.C.), and his son Alexander (about 480 B.C.). Herodotus gives us five successive kings between the founder Perdikkas and Amyntas—Perdikkas, Argæus, Philippus, Aëropus, Alketas, Amyntas, and Alexander—the contemporary and to a certain extent the ally of Xerxês.[1] Though we have no means of establishing any dates in this early series, either of names or of facts, yet we see that the Temenid kings, beginning from a humble origin, extended their dominions successively on all sides. They conquered the Briges,[2] originally their neighbours on Mount Bermius—the Eordi, bordering on Edessa to the westward, who were either destroyed or expelled from the country (a small remnant of them still existed in the time of Thucydidês at Physka between Strymôn and Axius) —the Almopians, an inland tribe of unknown site—and many of the interior Macedonian tribes who had been at first autonomous. Besides these inland conquests, they had made the still more important acquisition of Pieria (the territory which lay between Mount Bermius and the sea), from whence they expelled the original Pierians, who found new seats on the eastern bank of the Strymôn between Mount Pangæus and the sea. Amyntas king of Macedon was thus master of a very considerable territory, comprising the coast of the Thermaic Gulf as far north as the mouth of the Haliakmôn, and also some other territory on the same gulf from which the Bottiæans had been expelled; but not comprising the coast between the mouths of the Axius and the Haliakmôn, nor even Pella the subsequent capital, which were still in the hands of the Bottiæans at the period when Xerxês passed through.[3] He possessed also

Aggrandisement of the dynasty of Edessa—conquests as far as the Thermaic Gulf, as well as over the interior Macedonians.

[1] Herodot. viii. 139. Thucydidês agrees in the number of kings, but does not give the names (ii. 100).

For the divergent lists of the early Macedonian kings, see Mr. Clinton's Fasti Hellenici, vol. ii. p. 221.

[2] This may be gathered, I think, from Herodot. vii. 73 and viii. 138. The alleged migration of the Briges into Asia, and the change of their name to Phryges, is a statement which I do not venture to repeat as credible.

[3] Herodot. vii. 123. Herodotus recognises both Bottiæans between

Anthemûs, a town and territory in the peninsula of Chalkidikê, and some parts of Mygdonia, the territory east of the mouth of the Axius; but how much, we do not know. We shall find the Macedonians hereafter extending their dominion still farther, during the period between the Persian and Peloponnesian war.

Friendship between king Amyntas and the Peisistratids.

We hear of king Amyntas in friendly connexion with the Peisistratid princes at Athens, whose dominion was in part sustained by mercenaries from the Strymôn; and this amicable sentiment was continued between his son Alexander and the emancipated Athenians.[1] It is only in the reigns of these two princes that Macedonia begins to be implicated in Grecian affairs. The regal dynasty had become so completely Macedonised, and had so far renounced its Hellenic brotherhood, that the claim of Alexander to run at the Olympic games was contested by his competitors, who compelled him to prove his lineage before the Hellanodikæ.

the Axius and the Haliakmôn—and Bottiæans at Olynthus, whom the Macedonians had expelled from the Thermaic Gulf, at the time when Xerxês passed (viii. 127). These two statements seem to me compatible, and both admissible: the former Bottiæans were expelled by the Macedonians subsequently, anterior to the Peloponnesian war.

My view of these facts therefore differs somewhat from that of O. Müller (Macedonians, sect. 16).

[1] Herodot. i. 59; v. 94; viii. 136.

# CHAPTER XXVI.

## THRACIANS AND GREEK COLONIES IN THRACE.

THAT vast space comprised between the rivers Strymôn and Danube, and bounded to the west by the easternmost Illyrian tribes, northward of the Strymôn, was occupied by the innumerable subdivisions of the race called Thracians or Threïcians. They were the most numerous and most terrible race known to Herodotus; could they by possibility act in unison or under one dominion (he says) they would be irresistible. A conjunction thus formidable once seemed impending, during the first years of the Peloponnesian war, under the reign of Sitalkês king of the Odrysæ, who reigned from Abdêra at the mouth of the Nestus to the Euxine, and compressed under his sceptre a large proportion of these ferocious but warlike plunderers; so that the Greeks even down to Thermopylæ trembled at his expected approach. But the abilities of that prince were not found adequate to bring the whole force of Thrace into effective co-operation and aggression against others.

Thracians —their numbers and abode.

Numerous as the tribes of Thracians were, their customs and character (according to Herodotus) were marked by great uniformity: of the Getæ, the Trausi, and others, he tells us a few particularities. And the large tract over which the race were spread, comprising as it did the whole chain of Mount Hæmus and the still loftier chain of Rhodopê,[1] together with a portion of the mountains Orbêlus and

Many distinct tribes, yet little diversity of character.

[1] This territory of ancient Rhodopê—the inland space between the Strymôn, the Hebrus, and the Ægean Sea—has been less visited by modern travellers, and is at present more thoroughly unknown, than any part of European Turkey. M. Viquesnel visited it in 1847, and the topographical data collected by him (embodied in a report made to the French Government) have been employed by Kiepert in the preparation of his new map of European Turkey, just published (1853). But Viquesnel's own map of the region of Rhodopê has not

Skomius, was yet partly occupied by level and fertile surface—such as the great plain of Adrianople, and the land towards the lower course of the rivers Nestus and Hebrus. The Thracians of the plain, though not less warlike, were at least more home-keeping, and less greedy of foreign plunder, than those of the mountains. But the general character of the race presents an aggregate of repulsive features, unredeemed by the presence of even the commonest domestic affections.[1] The Thracian chief deduced his pedigree from a god called by the Greeks Hermês, to whom he offered up worship apart from the rest of his tribe, sometimes with the acceptable present of a human victim. He tattooed his body,[2] and that of the women belonging to him, as a privilege of honourable descent: he bought his wives from their parents, and sold his children for exportation to the foreign merchant: he held it disgraceful to cultivate the earth, and felt honoured only by the acquisitions of war and robbery. The Thracian tribes worshipped deities whom the Greeks assimilate to Arês, Dionysus, and Artemis. The great sanctuary and oracle of their god Dionysus was in one of the loftiest summits of Rhodopê, amidst dense and foggy thickets—the residence of the fierce and unassailable Satræ. To illustrate the Thracian character, we may turn to a deed perpetrated by the king of the Bisaltæ—perhaps one out of several chiefs of that extensive Thracian tribe—whose territory, between Strymôn and Axius, lay in the direct march of Xerxês into Greece, and who, to escape the ignominy of being dragged along amidst the compulsory auxiliaries of the Persian invasion, fled to the heights of Rhodopê, forbidding his six sons to take any part in it. From recklessness or curiosity, the sons disobeyed his commands, and accompanied Xerxês into Greece. They returned unhurt by the Greek spear, but the incensed father, when they again came into his presence, caused the eyes of all of them to be put out. Exultation of success

Their cruelty, rapacity, and military efficiency.

yet appeared (see Kiepert's Erläuterungen, annexed to his Map, p. 5).

[1] Mannert assimilates the civilization of the Thracians to that of the Gauls when Julius Cæsar invaded them—a great injustice to the latter, in my judgment (Geograph. der Gr. und Röm. vol. ii. p. 23).

[2] Cicero, De Officiis, ii. 7. "Barbarum compunctum notis Threicîis." Plutarch (De Serâ Numin. Vindict. c. 13, p. 558) speaks as if the women only were tattooed in Thrace: he puts a singular interpretation upon it, as a continuous punishment on the sex for having slain Orpheus.

manifested itself in the Thracians by increased alacrity in shedding blood; but as warriors, the only occupation which they esteemed, they were not less brave than patient of hardship; maintaining a good front, under their own peculiar array, against forces much superior in all military efficacy.[1] It appears that the Thynians and Bithynians,[2] on the Asiatic side of the Bosphorus, perhaps also the Mysians, were members of this great Thracian race, which was more remotely connected also with the Phrygians. And the whole race may be said to present a character more Asiatic than European, especially in those ecstatic and maddening religious rites, which prevailed not less among the Edonian Thracians than in the mountains of Ida and Dindymon of Asia, though with some important differences. The Thracians served to furnish the Greeks with mercenary troops and slaves, and the number of Grecian colonies planted on the coast had the effect of partially softening the tribes in the immediate vicinity, between whose chiefs and the Greek leaders intermarriages were not unfrequent. But the tribes in the interior seem to have retained their savage habits with little mitigation; so that the language in which Tacitus[3] describes them is an apt continuation to that of Herodotus, though coming more than five centuries after.

Thracian worship and character Asiatic.

To note the situation of each one among these many different tribes, in the large territory of Thrace, which is even now imperfectly known and badly mapped, would be unnecessary and indeed impracticable. I shall proceed to mention the principal Grecian colonies which were formed in the country, noticing occasionally the particular Thracian tribes with which they came in contact.

The Grecian colonies established on the Thermaic Gulf, as well as in the peninsula of Chalkidikê—emanating principally from Chalkis and Eretria, though we do not know their precise epoch—appear to have been of early date, and probably preceded the time when the

Early date of the Chalkidic colonies in Thrace.

[1] For the Thracians generally, see Herodot. v. 3—9, vii. 110, viii. 116, ix. 119; Thucyd. ii. 100, vii. 29, 30; Xenophôn, Anabas. vii. 2, 38, and the seventh book of the Anabasis generally, which describes the relations of Xenophôn and the Ten Thousand Greeks with Seuthês the Thracian prince.

[2] Xenoph. Anab. vi. 2, 17; Herodot. vii. 75.

[3] Tacit. Annal. ii. 66; iv. 46.

Macedonians of Edessa extended their conquest to the sea. At that early period they would find the Pierians still between the Peneius and Haliakmôn—also a number of petty Thracian tribes throughout the broad part of the Chalkidic peninsula; they would find Pydna a Pierian town, and Therma, Anthemus, Chalastra, &c., Mygdonian.

Methônê the earliest—about 720 B.C.

The most ancient Grecian colony in these regions seems to have been Methônê, founded by the Eretrians in Pieria: nearly at the same time (if we may trust a statement of rather suspicious character, though the date itself is noway improbable) as Korkyra was settled by the Corinthians (about 730—720 B.C.[1]). It was a little to the north of the Pierian town of Pydna, and separated by about ten miles from the Bottiæan town of Alôrus, which lay north of the Haliakmôn.[2] We know very little about Methônê, except that it preserved its autonomy and its Hellenism until the time of Philip of Macedon, who took and destroyed it. But though, when once established, it was strong enough to maintain itself in spite of conquest made all around by the Macedonians of Edessa, we may fairly presume that it could not have been originally planted on Macedonian territory. Nor in point of fact was the situation peculiarly advantageous for Grecian colonists, inasmuch as there were other maritime towns, not Grecian, in its neighbourhood—Pydna, Alôrus, Therma, Chalastra; whereas the point of advantage for a Grecian colony was, to become the exclusive seaport for inland indigenous people.

Several other small settlements on the Chalkidic peninsula and its three projecting headlands.

The colonies, founded by Chalkis and Eretria on all the three projections of the Chalkidic peninsula, were numerous, though for a long time inconsiderable. We do not know how far these projecting headlands were occupied before the arrival of the settlers from Eubœa. Such arrival we may probably place at some period earlier than 600 B.C. For after that period Chalkis and Eretria seem rather on the decline; and it appears too that the Chalkidian colonists in Thrace aided their mother-city Chalkis in her war against Eretria, which cannot be much later than 600 B.C., though it may be considerably earlier.

The range of mountains which crosses from the Thermaic to

1 Plutarch, Quæst. Græc. p. 293. 2 Skylax, c. 67.

the Strymonic Gulf and forms the northern limit of the Chalkidic peninsula, slopes down towards the southern extremity, so as to leave a considerable tract of fertile land between the Torônaic and the Thermaic Gulfs, including the fertile headland called Pallênê—the westernmost of those three prongs of Chalkidikê which run out into the Ægean. Of the other two prongs or projections, the easternmost is terminated by the sublime Mount Athos, which rises out of the sea as a precipitous rock 6400 feet in height, connected with the mainland by a ridge not more than half the height of the mountain itself, yet still high, rugged, and woody from sea to sea, leaving only little occasional spaces fit to be occupied or cultivated. The intermediate or Sithonian headland is also hilly and woody, though in a less degree—both less inviting and less productive than Pallênê.[1]

Chalkidic peninsula —Mount Athos.

Æneia, near that cape which marks the entrance of the inner Thermaic Gulf—and Potidæa, at the narrow isthmus of Pallênê —were both founded by Corinth. Between these two towns lay the fertile territory called Krusis or Krossæa, forming in aftertimes a part of the domain of Olynthus, but in the sixth century B.C. occupied by petty Thracian townships.[2] Within Pallênê were the towns of Mendê, a colony from Eretria—Skiônê, which, having no legitimate mother-city, traced its origin to Pellenian warriors returning from Troy—Aphytis, Neapolis, Ægê, Therambôs, and Sanê,[3] either wholly or partly colonies from Eretria. In the Sithonian peninsula were Assa, Pilôrus, Singus, Sartê, Torônê, Galêpsus, Sermylê, and Mekyberna: all or most of these seem to have been of Chalkidic origin. But at the head of the Torônaic Gulf (which lies between Sithonia and Pallênê) was placed Olynthus, surrounded by an extensive and fertile plain. Originally a Bottiæan town, Olynthus will be seen at the time of the Persian invasion to pass into the hands of

Colonies in Pallênê, or the westernmost of the three headlands.

In Sithonia, or the middle headland.

[1] For the description of Chalkidikê, see Grisebach's Reisen, vol. ii. ch. 10, pp. 6—16, and Leake, Travels in Northern Greece, vol. iii. ch. 24, p. 152.

If we read attentively the description of Chalkidikê as given by Skylax (c. 67), we shall see that he did not conceive it as three-pronged, but as terminating only in the peninsula of Pallênê, with Potidæa at its isthmus.

[2] Herodot. vii. 123; Skymnus Chius, v. 627.

[3] Strabo, x. p. 447; Thucyd. iv. 120—123; Pompon. Mela, ii. 2; Herodot. vii. 123.

the Chalkidian Greeks,[1] and gradually to incorporate with itself several of the petty neighbouring establishments belonging to that race; whereby the Chalkidians acquired that marked preponderance in the peninsula which they retained, even against the efforts of Athens, until the days of Philip of Macedon.

In the headland of Athos—Akanthus, Stageira, &c.

On the scanty spaces, admitted by the mountainous promontory or ridge ending in Athos, were planted some Thracian and some Pelasgic settlements of the same inhabitants as those who occupied Lêmnos and Imbros; a few Chalkidic citizens being domiciliated with them, and the people speaking both Pelasgic and Hellenic. But near the narrow isthmus which joins this promontory to Thrace, and along the north-western coast of the Strymonic Gulf, were Grecian towns of considerable importance—Sanê, Akanthus, Stageira, and Argilus, all colonies from Andros, which had itself been colonised from Eretria.[2] Akanthus and Stageira are said to have been founded in 654 B.C.

Greek settlements east of the Strymôn in Thrace.

Following the southern coast of Thrace, from the mouth of the river Strymôn towards the east, we may doubt whether, in the year 560 B.C., any considerable independent colonies of Greeks had yet been formed upon it. The Ionic colony of Abdêra, eastward of the mouth of the river Nestus, formed from Teôs in Ionia, is of more recent date, though the Klazomenians[3] had begun an unsuccessful settlement there as early as the year 651 B.C.; while Dikæa—the Chian settlement of Maroneia—and the Lesbian settlement of Ænus at the mouth of the Hebrus—are of unknown date.[4] The important and valuable territory near the mouth of the Strymôn, where, after many ruinous failures,[5] the Athenian colony of Amphipolis afterwards maintained itself, was at the date here mentioned possessed by Edonian Thracians and Pierians. The various Thracian tribes—Satræ, Edonians, Dersæans, Sapæans, Bistones, Kikones, Pætians, &c.—were in

[1] Herodot. vii. 122; viii. 127. Stephanus Byz. (v. Παλλήνη) gives us some idea of the mythes of the lost Greek writers, Hêgesippus and Theagenês, about Pallênê.

[2] Thucyd. iv. 84, 103, 109. See Mr. Clinton's Fasti Hellenici, ad ann. 654 B.C.

[3] Solinus, x. 10.

[4] Herodot. i. 168; vii. 58—59, 109; Skymnus Chius, v. 675.

[5] Thucyd. i. 100, iv. 102; Herodot. v. 11. Large quantities of corn are now exported from this territory to Constantinople (Leake, North. Gr., vol. iii. ch. 25, p. 172).

force on the principal part of the tract between Strymôn and Hebrus, even to the sea-coast. It is to be remarked however that the island of Thasus, and that of Samothrace, each possessed what in Greek was called a Peræa[1]—a strip of the adjoining mainland cultivated and defended by means of fortified posts or small towns. Probably these occupations are of very ancient date, since they seem almost indispensable as a means of support to the islands. For the barren Thasus, especially, merits even at this day the uninviting description applied to it by the poet Archilochus, in the seventh century B.C.— "an ass's backbone, overspread with wild wood";[2] so wholly is it composed of mountain naked or wooded, and so scanty are the patches of cultivable soil left in it, nearly all close to the sea-shore.

Island of Thasus.

This island was originally occupied by the Phœnicians, who worked the gold-mines in its mountains with a degree of industry, which, even in its remains, excited the admiration of Herodotus. How and when it was evacuated by them, we do not know. But the poet Archilochus[3] formed one of a body of Parian colonists who planted themselves on it in the seventh century B.C., and carried on war, not always successful, against the Thracian tribe called Saians: on one occasion, Archilochus found himself compelled to throw away his shield. By their mines and their possessions on the mainland (which contained even richer mines, at Skaptê Hylê, and elsewhere, than those in the island), the Thasian Greeks rose to considerable power and population. And as they seem to have been the only Greeks, until the settlement of the Milesian Histiæus on the Strymôn about 510 B.C., who actively concerned themselves in the mining districts of Thrace

[1] Herodot. vii. 108—109; Thucyd. i. 101.

[2] . . . ἦδε δ' ὥστ' ὄνου ῥάχις
Ἑστηκεν, ὕλης ἀγρίας ἐπιστεφής.
Archiloch. Fragm. 17—18, ed. Schneidewin.

The striking propriety of this description, even after the lapse of 2500 years, may be seen in the Travels of Grisebach, vol. i. ch. 7, p. 210—218, and in Prokesch, Denkwürdigkeiten des Orients, Th. 3, p. 612. The view of Thasus from the sea justifies the title Ἠερίη (Œnomaus ap. Euseb. Præpar. Evang. vii. p. 256; Steph. Byz. Θάσσος). Thasus (now Tasso) contains at present a population of about 6000 Greeks, dispersed in twelve small villages; it exports some good ship-timber, principally fir, of which there is abundance on the island, together with some olive oil and wax; but it cannot grow corn enough even for this small population. No mines either are now, or have been for a long time, in work.

[3] Archiloch. Fragm. 5, ed. Schneidewin; Aristophan. Pac. 1298, with the Scholia; Strabo, x. p. 487, xii. p. 549; Thucyd. iv. 104.

opposite to their island, we cannot be surprised to hear that their clear surplus revenue before the Persian conquest, about 493 B.C., after defraying the charges of their government without any taxation, amounted to the large sum of 200 talents, sometimes even to 300 talents, in each year (£46,000—£66,000).

Thracian Chersonesus.

On the long peninsula called the Thracian Chersonese there may probably have been small Grecian settlements at an early date, though we do not know at what time either the Milesian settlement of Kardia, on the western side of the isthmus of that peninsula, near the Ægean Sea—or the Æolic colony of Sestus on the Hellespont—was founded. The Athenian ascendency in the peninsula begins only with the migration of the first Miltiadês, during the reign of Peisistratus at Athens.

Perinthus, Selymbria, and Byzantium.

The Samian colony of Perinthus, on the northern coast of the Propontis,[1] is spoken of as ancient in date, and the Megarian colonies, Selymbria and Byzantium, belong to the seventh century B.C.: the latter of these two is assigned to the 30th Olympiad (657 B.C.), and its neighbour Chalkêdôn, on the opposite coast, was a few years earlier. The site of Byzantium in the narrow strait of the Bosphorus, with its abundant thunny-fishery,[2] which both employed and nourished a large proportion of the poorer freemen, was alike convenient either for maritime traffic or for levying contributions on the numerous corn ships which passed from the Euxine into the Ægean. We are even told that it held a considerable number of the neighbouring Bithynian Thracians as tributary Perioeki. Such dominion, though probably maintained during the more vigorous period of Grecian city life, became in later times impracticable, and we even find the Byzantines not always competent to the defence of their own small surrounding territory. The place, however, will be found to possess considerable importance during all the period of this history.[3]

The Grecian settlements on the inhospitable south-western coast of the Euxine, south of the Danube, appear never to have attained any consideration: the principal traffic of Greek

[1] Skymnus Chius, 699—715; Plutarch, Quæst. Græc. c. 57. See M. Raoul Rochette, Histoire des Colonies Grecques, ch. xi.—xiv., vol. iii. p. 273—298.

[2] Aristot. Polit. iv. 4, 1.

[3] Polyb. iv. 39; Phylarch. Fragm. 10, ed. Didot.

ships in that sea tended to more northerly ports, on the banks of the Borysthenês and in the Tauric Chersonese. Istria was founded by the Milesians near the southern embouchure of the Danube—Apollonia and Odêssus on the same coast more to the south—all probably between 600—560 B.C. The Megarian or Byzantine colony of Mesambria seems to have been later than the Ionic revolt: of Kallatis the age is not known. Tomi, north of Kallatis and south of Istria, is renowned as the place of Ovid's banishment.[1] The picture which he gives of that uninviting spot, which enjoyed but little truce from the neighbourhood of the murderous Getæ, explains to us sufficiently why these towns acquired little or no importance.

Grecian settlements on the Euxine, south of the Danube.

The islands of Lêmnos and Imbros, in the Ægean, were at this early period occupied by Tyrrhenian Pelasgi. They were conquered by the Persians about 508 B.C., and seem to have passed into the power of the Athenians, at the time when Ionia revolted from the Persians. If the mythical or poetical stories respecting these Tyrrhenian Pelasgi contain any basis of truth, they must have been a race of buccaneers not less rapacious than cruel. At one time, these Pelasgi seem also to have possessed Samothrace, but how or when they were supplanted by Greeks, we find no trustworthy account: the population of Samothrace at the time of the Persian war was Ionic.[2]

Lêmnos and Imbros.

[1] Skymnus Chius, 720—740; Herodot. ii. 33, vi. 33; Strabo, vii. p. 319; Skylax, c. 68; Mannert, Geograph. d. Gr. und Röm., vol. vii. ch. 8, p. 126—140.

An inscription in Boeckh's Collection proves the existence of a pentapolis or union of five Grecian cities on this coast. Tomi, Kallatis, Mesambria, and Apollonia are presumed by Blaramberg to have belonged to this union. See Inscript. No. 2056 *c*.

Syncellus however (p. 213) places the foundation of Istria considerably earlier, in 651 B.C.

[2] Herodot. viii. 90.

## CHAPTER XXVII.

### KYRÊNÊ AND BARKA.—HESPERIDES.

It has been already mentioned in a former chapter that Psammetichus king of Egypt, about the middle of the seventh century B.C., first removed those prohibitions which had excluded Grecian commerce from the country. In his reign, Grecian mercenaries were first established in Egypt, and Grecian traders admitted, under certain regulations, into the Nile. The opening of this new market emboldened them to traverse the direct sea which separates Krête from Egypt—a dangerous voyage with vessels which rarely ventured to lose sight of land—and seems to have first made them acquainted with the neighbouring coast of Libya, between the Nile and the gulf called the Great Syrtis. Hence arose the foundation of the important colony called Kyrênê.

First voyage of the Greeks to Libya.

As in the case of most other Grecian colonies, so in that of Kyrênê, both the foundation and the early history are very imperfectly known. The date of the event, as far as can be made out amidst much contradiction of statement, was about 630 B.C.[1] Thêra was the mother-city, herself a colony from Lacedæmôn; and the settlements formed in Libya became no inconsiderable ornaments to the Dorian name in Hellas.

According to the account of a lost historian, Meneklês[2]—political dissension among the inhabitants of Thêra led to that emigration which founded Kyrênê. The more ample legendary details which Herodotus collected, partly from Theræan, partly from Kyrenæan informants, are not

Foundation of Kyrênê.

[1] See the discussion of the æra of Kyrênê in Thrige, Historia Cyrênês, ch. 22, 23, 24, where the different statements are noticed and compared.

[2] Schol. ad Pindar. Pyth. iv.

positively inconsistent with this statement, though they indicate more particularly bad seasons, distress, and over-population. But both of them dwell emphatically on the Delphian oracle as the instigator as well as the director of the first emigrants, whose apprehensions of a dangerous voyage and an unknown country were very difficult to overcome. Both of them affirmed that the original œkist Battus was selected and consecrated to the work by the divine command: both called Battus the son of Polymnêstus, of the mythical breed called Minyæ. But on other points there was complete divergence between the two stories, and the Kyrenæans themselves, whose town was partly peopled by emigrants from Krête, described the mother of Battus as daughter of Etearchus, prince of the Kretan town of Axus.[1] Battus had an impediment in his speech, and it was on his entreating from the Delphian oracle a cure for this infirmity that he received directions to go as "a cattle-breeding œkist to Libya". The suffering Theræans were directed to assist him. But neither he nor they knew where Libya was, nor could they find any resident in Krête who had ever visited it. Such was the limited reach of Grecian navigation to the south of the Ægean Sea, even a century after the foundation of Syracuse. At length, by prolonged inquiry, they discovered a man employed in catching the purple shellfish, name Korôbius, who said that he had been once forced by stress of weather to the island of Platea, close on the shores of Libya, and on the side not far removed from the western limit of Egypt. Some Theræans being sent along with Korôbius to inspect the island, left him there with a stock of provisions, and returned to Thêra to conduct the emigrants. From the seven districts into which Thêra was divided, emigrants were drafted for the colony, one brother being singled out from the different numerous families by lot. But so long was their return to Platea deferred, that the provisions of Korôbius were exhausted, and he was only saved from starvation by the accidental arrival of a Samian ship, driven by contrary winds out of her course on the voyage to Egypt. Kôlæus, the master of this ship (whose immense profits made by the first voyage to Tartêssus have been noticed in a former

Founded by Battus from the island of Thêra.

[1] Herodot. iv. 150—154.

chapter), supplied him with provisions for a year—an act of kindness which is said to have laid the first foundation of the alliance and good feeling afterwards prevalent between Thêra, Kyrênê, and Samos. At length the expected emigrants reached the island, having found the voyage so perilous and difficult, that they at once returned in despair to Thêra, where they were only prevented by force from re-landing. The band which accompanied Battus was all conveyed in two pentekonters—armed ships with fifty rowers each. Thus humble was the start of the mighty Kyrênê, which, in the days of Herodotus, covered a city-area equal to the entire island of Platea.[1]

Colony first settled in the island of Platea—afterwards removed to Kyrênê.

That island, however, though near to Libya, and supposed by the colonists to be Libya, was not so in reality: the commands of the oracle had not been literally fulfilled. Accordingly the settlement carried with it nothing but hardship for the space of two years; and Battus returned with his companions to Delphi, to complain that the promised land had proved a bitter disappointment. The god, through his priestess, returned for answer, "If you, who have never visited the cattle-breeding Libya, know it better than I who *have*, I greatly admire your cleverness". Again the inexorable mandate forced them to return. This time they planted themselves on the actual continent of Libya, nearly over against the island of Platea, in a district called Aziris, surrounded on both sides by fine woods, and with a running stream adjoining. After six years of residence in this spot, they were persuaded by some of the indigenous Libyans to abandon it, under the promise that they should be conducted to a better situation. Their guides now brought them to the actual site of Kyrênê, saying, "Here, men of Hellas, is the place for you to dwell, for here the sky is perforated".[2] The road through which they passed had led through the tempting region of Irasa with its fountain Thestê, and their guides took the precaution to carry them through it by night, in order that they might remain ignorant of its beauties.

1 Herodot. iv. 155.

2 Herodot. iv. 158. ἐνθαῦτα γὰρ ὁ οὐρανὸς τέτρηται. Compare the jest ascribed to the Byzantian envoys on occasion of the vaunts of Lysimachus (Plutarch, De Fortunâ Alexandr. Magn. c. 3, p. 338).

Such were the preliminary steps, divine and human, which brought Battus and his colonists to Kyrênê. In the time of Herodotus, Irasa was an outlying portion of the eastern territory of this powerful city. But we trace in the story just related an opinion prevalent among his Kyrenæan informants, that Irasa with its fountain Thestê was a more inviting position than Kyrênê with its fountain of Apollo, and ought in prudence to have been originally chosen: out of which opinion, according to the general habit of the Greek mind, an anecdote is engendered and accredited, explaining how the supposed mistake was committed. What may have been the recommendations of Irasa, we are not permitted to know; but descriptions of modern travellers, no less than the subsequent history of Kyrênê, go far to justify the choice actually made. The city was placed at the distance of about ten miles from the sea, having a sheltered port called Apollonia, itself afterwards a considerable town—it was about twenty miles from the promontory Phykus, which forms the northernmost projection of the African coast, nearly in the longitude of the Peloponnesian Cape Tænarus (Matapan). Kyrênê was situated about 1800 feet above the level of the Mediterranean, of which it commanded a fine view, and from which it was conspicuously visible, on the edge of a range of hills which slope by successive terraces down to the port. The soil immediately around, partly calcareous, partly sandy, is described by Captain Beechey to present a vigorous vegetation and remarkable fertility; though the ancients considered it inferior in this respect both to Barka[1] and Hesperides, and still more inferior to the more westerly region near Kinyps. But the abundant periodical rains, attracted by the lofty heights around, and justifying the expression of the "perforated sky," were even of greater importance under an African sun than extraordinary richness of soil.[2] The maritime

Situation of Kyrênê.

[1] Herodot. iv. 198.

[2] See, about the productive powers of Kyrênê and its surrounding region, Herodot. iv. 199; Kallimachus (himself a Kyrenæan), Hymn. ad Apoll. 65, with the note of Spanheim; Pindar, Pyth. iv., with the Scholia *passim;* Diodor. iii. 49; Arrian, Indica, xliii. 13. Strabo (xvii. p. 837) saw Kyrênê from the sea in sailing by, and was struck with the view: he does not appear to have landed.

The results of modern observation in that country are given in the Viaggio of Della Cella and in the exploring expedition of Captain Beechey: see an interesting summary in the History of the Barbary States, by Dr. Russell (Edinburgh, 1835), ch. v. p. 160—171. The chapter on this subject (c. 6) in

regions near Kyrênê and Barka, and Hesperides, produced oil and wine as well as corn, while the extensive district between these towns, composed of alternate mountain, wood, and plain, was eminently suited for pasture and cattle-breeding. The ports were secure, presenting conveniences for the intercourse of the Greek trader with Northern Africa, such as were not to be found along all the coast of the Great Syrtis westward of Hesperides.

**Fertility, produce, and prosperity.**

Abundance of applicable land—great diversity both of climate and of productive season, between the sea-side, the low hill, and the upper mountain, within a small space, so that harvest was continually going on, and fresh produce coming in from the earth, during eight months of the year—together with the monopoly of the valuable plant called the Silphium, which grew nowhere except in the Kyrenaic region, and the juice of which was extensively demanded throughout Greece and Italy—led to the rapid growth of Kyrênê, in spite of serious and renewed political troubles. And even now, the immense remains which still mark its desolate site, the evidences of past labour and solicitude at the Fountain of Apollo and elsewhere, together with the profusion of excavated and ornamented tombs, attest sufficiently what the grandeur of the

Thrige's Historia Cyrênês is defective, as the author seems never to have seen the careful and valuable observations of Captain Beechey, and proceeds chiefly on the statements of Della Cella.

I refer briefly to a few among the many interesting notices of Captain Beechey. For the site of the ancient Hesperides (Bengazi), and the "beautiful fertile plain near it, extending to the foot of a long chain of mountains about fourteen miles distant to the south-eastward,"—see Beechey, *Expedition*, ch. xi. p. 287—315; "a great many date-palm trees in the neighbourhood" (ch. xii. p. 340—354.

The distance between Bengazi (Hesperides) and Ptolemeta (Ptolemais, the port of Barka) is fifty-seven geographical miles, along a fertile and beautiful plain, stretching from the mountains to the sea. Between these two was situated the ancient Teucheira (*ib.* ch. xii. p. 347), about thirty-eight miles from Hesperides (p. 349), in a country highly productive wherever it is cultivated (p. 350—355). Exuberant vegetation exists near the deserted Ptolemeta (or Ptolemais) after the winter rains (p. 364). The circuit of Ptolemais, as measured by the ruins of its walls, was about three and a-half English miles (p. 380).

An extensive, fertile, and well-watered mountain plain of Mergê, constituted the territory of the ancient Barka (*ib.* ch. xiii. p. 395—401): the bricks, which the Arabic geographers state to have been exported from Barka to Egypt (p. 399), are noticed by Stephan. Byzant. (v. Βάρκη) as constituting the material of the houses at Barka.

The road from Barka to Kyrênê presents continued marks of ancient chariot-wheels (ch. xiv. p. 406); after passing the plain of Mergê, it becomes hilly and woody, "but on approaching Grenna (Kyrênê) it becomes more clear of wood; the valleys produce fine crops of barley, and the hills excellent pasturage for cattle" (p. 409). Luxuriant vegetation comes after the winter rains in the vicinity of Kyrênê (ch. xv. p. 465).

place must have been in the days of Herodotus and Pindar. So much did the Kyrenæans pride themselves on the Silphium, found wild in their back country from the island of Platea on the east to the inner recess of the Great Syrtis westward—the leaves of which were highly salubrious for cattle and the stalk for man, while the root furnished the peculiar juice for export—that they maintained it to have first appeared seven years prior to the arrival of the first Grecian colonists in their city.[1]

But it was not only the properties of the soil which promoted the prosperity of Kyrênê. Isokratês[2] praises the well-chosen site of that colony, because it was planted in the midst of indigenous natives apt for subjection, and far distant from any formidable enemies. That the native Libyan tribes were made conducive in an eminent degree to the growth of the Greco-Libyan cities, admits of no doubt; and in reviewing the history of these cities, we must bear in mind that their population was not pure Greek, but more or less mixed, like that of the colonies in Italy, Sicily, or Ionia. Though our information is very imperfect, we see enough to prove that the small force brought over by Battus the Stammerer was enabled first to fraternise with the indigenous Libyans—next, reinforced by additional colonists and availing themselves of the power of native chiefs, to overawe and subjugate them. Kyrênê—combined with Barka and Hesperides, both of them having sprung from her root[3]—exercised over the Libyan tribes between the borders of Egypt and the inner recess of the Great Syrtis, for a space of three degrees of longitude, an ascendency similar to that which Carthage possessed over the more westerly Libyans near the Lesser Syrtis. Within these Kyrenæan limits, and farther westward along the shores of the Great Syrtis, the Libyan tribes were of pastoral habits; westward, beyond the Lake Tritônis and the Lesser Syrtis,[4] they began to be agri-

Libyan tribes near Kyrênê.

[1] Theophrast. Hist. Pl. vi. 3, 3; ix. 1, 7: Skylax, c. 107.

[2] Isokratês, Or. v. ad Philipp. p. 84 (p. 107, ed. Bek.). Thêra being a colony of Lacedæmôn, and Kyrênê of Thêra, Isokratês speaks of Kyrênê as a colony of Lacedæmôn.

[3] Pindar, Pyth. iv. 26. Κυρήνην—ἀστέων ῥίζαν. In the time of Herodotus these three cities may possibly have been spoken of as a Tripolis: but no one before Alexander the Great would have understood the expression Pentapolis, used under the Romans to denote Kyrênê, Apollonia, Ptolemais, Teucheira, and Berenikê or Hesperides.

Ptolemais, originally the port of Barka, had become autonomous and of greater importance than the latter.

[4] The accounts respecting the lake

cultural. Immediately westward of Egypt were the Adyrmachidæ, bordering upon Apis and Marea, the Egyptian frontier towns;[1] they were subject to the Egyptians, and had adopted some of the minute ritual and religious observances which characterised the region of the Nile. Proceeding westward from the Adyrmachidæ were found the Giligammæ, the Asbystæ, the Auschisæ, the Kabales, and the Nasamônes—the latter of whom occupied the south-eastern corner of the Great Syrtis—next, the Makæ, Gindânes, Lotophagi, Machlyes, as far as a certain river and lake called Tritôn and Tritônis, which seems to have been near the Lesser Syrtis. These last-mentioned tribes were not dependent either on Kyrênê or on Carthage, at the time of Herodotus, nor probably during the proper period of free Grecian history (600—300 B.C.). But in the third century B.C., the Ptolemaic governors of Kyrênê extended their dominion westward, while Carthage pushed her colonies and castles eastward, so that the two powers embraced between them the whole line of coast between the Greater and Lesser Syrtis, meeting at the spot called the Altars of the Brothers Philæni—celebrated for its commemorative legend.[2] Moreover, even in the sixth century B.C., Carthage was jealous of the extension of Grecian colonies along this coast, and aided the Libyan Makæ (about 510 B.C.) to expel the Spartan prince Dorieus from his settlement near the river Kinyps: near that spot was afterwards planted, by Phœnician or Carthaginian exiles, the town of Leptis Magna[3] (now Lebida), which does not seem to have existed in the time of Herodotus. Nor does the latter historian notice the Marmaridæ, who appear as the principal Libyan tribe near the west of Egypt between the age of Skylax and the third century of the Christian æra. Some

Extensive dominion of Kyrênê and Barka over the Libyans.

called in ancient times Tritônis are however very uncertain: see Dr. Shaw's Travels in Barbary, p. 127. Strabo mentions a lake so called near Hesperides (xvii. p. 836); Pherekydês talks of it as near Irasa (Pherekyd. Fragm. 33 *d.* ed. Didot).

[1] Eratosthenês, born at Kyrênê and resident at Alexandria, estimated the land-journey between the two at 525 Roman miles (Pliny, H. N. v. 6).

[2] Sallust, Bell. Jugurth. c. 75; Valerius Maximus, v. 6. Thrige (Histor. Cyr. c. 49) places this division of the Syrtis between Kyrênê and Carthage at some period between 400—330 B.C., anterior to the loss of the independence of Kyrênê; but I cannot think that it was earlier than the Ptolemies: compare Strabo, xvii. p. 836.

[3] The Carthaginian establishment Neapolis is mentioned by Skylax (c. 109), and Strabo states that Leptis was another name for the same place (xvii. p. 835).

migration or revolution subsequent to the time of Herodotus must have brought this name into predominance.[1]

The interior country stretching westward from Egypt (along the thirtieth and thirty-first parallel of latitude) to the Great Syrtis, and then along the southern shore of that gulf, is to a great degree low and sandy, and quite destitute of trees, yet affording in many parts water, herbage, and a fertile soil.[2] But the maritime region north of this, constituting the projecting bosom of the African coast from the island of Platea (Gulf of Bomba) on the east to Hesperides (Bengazi) on the west, is of a totally different character; covered with mountains of consi erable elevation, which reach their highest point near Kyrênê, interspersed with productive plain and valley, broken by frequent ravines which carry off the winter torrents into the sea, and never at any time of the year destitute of water. It is this latter advantage that causes them to be now visited every summer by the Bedouin

Connexion of the Greek colonies with the Nomads of Libya.

[1] Skylax, c. 107; Vopiscus, Vit. Prob. c. 9; Strabo, xvii. p. 838; Pliny, H. N. v. 5. From the Libyan tribe Marmaridæ was derived the name Marmarika applied to that region.

[2] ταπεινή τε καὶ ψαμμώδης (Herodot. iv. 191); Sallust, Bell. Jugurthin. c. 17. Captain Beechey points out the mistaken conceptions which have been entertained of this region:—

"It is not only in the works of early writers that we find the nature of the Syrtis misunderstood; for the whole of the space between Mesurata (*i. e.* the cape which forms the western extremity of the Great Syrtis) and Alexandria is described by Leo Africanus, under the title of Barca, as a wild and desert country, where there is neither water nor land capable of cultivation. He tells us that the most powerful among the Mahometan invaders possessed themselves of the fertile parts of the coast, leaving the others only the desert for their abode, exposed to all the miseries and privations attendant upon it; for this desert (he continues) is far removed from any habitations, and nothing is produced there whatever. So that if these poor people would have a supply of grain, or of any other articles necessary to their existence, they are obliged to p dge their children to the Sicilians who visit the coast; who, on providing them with these things, carry off the children they have received . . . .

"It appears to be chiefly from Leo Africanus that modern historians have derived their idea of what they term the district and desert of Barca. Yet the whole of the Cyrenaica is comprehended within the limits which they assign to it; and the authority of Herodotus, without citing any other, would be amply sufficient to prove that this tract of country not only was no desert, but was at all times remarkable for its fertility . . . . The impression left upon our minds, after reading the account of Herodotus, would be much more consistent with the appearance and peculiarities of both, in their actual state, than that which would result from the description of any succeeding writer . . . . The district of Barca, including all the country between Mesurata and Alexandria, neither is, nor ever was, so destitute and barren as has been represented; the part of it which constitutes the Cyrenaica is capable of the highest degree of cultivation, and many parts of the Syrtis afford excellent pasturage, while some of it is not only adapted to cultivation, but does actually produce good crops of barley and dhurra." (Captain Beechey, Expedition to Northern Coast of Africa, ch. x. pp. 263, 265, 267, 269: comp. ch. xi. p. 321.)

Arabs, who flock to the inexhaustible Fountain of Apollo and to other parts of the mountainous region from Kyrênê to Hesperides, when their supply of water and herbage fails in the interior;[1] and the same circumstance must have operated in ancient times to hold the Nomadic Libyans in a sort of dependence on Kyrênê and Barka. Kyrênê appropriated the maritime portion of the territory of the Libyan Asbystæ:[2] the Auschisæ occupied the region south of Barka, touching the sea near Hesperides: the Kabales dwelt near Teucheira in the territory of Barka. Over the interior spaces these Libyan Nomads, with their cattle and twisted tents, wandered unrestrained, amply fed upon meat and milk,[3] clothed in goat skins, and enjoying better health than any people known to Herodotus. Their breed of horses was excellent, and their chariots or waggons with four horses could perform feats admired even by Greeks. It was to these horses that the princes[4]

[1] Justin. xiii. 7, "amœnitatem loci et fontium ubertatem". Captain Beechey notices this annual migration of the Bedouin Arabs:—

"Teucheira (on the coast between Hesperides and Barka) abounds in wells of excellent water, which are reserved by the Arabs for their summer consumption, and only resorted to when the more inland supplies are exhausted: at other times it is uninhabited. Many of the excavated tombs are occupied as dwelling-houses by the Arabs during their summer visits to that part of the coast." (Beechey, Exp. to Northern Africa, ch. xii. p. 354.)

And about the wide mountain plain, or table-land of Mergê, the site of the ancient Barka, "The water from the mountains enclosing the plain settles in pools and lakes in different parts of this spacious valley; and affords a constant supply, during the summer months, to the Arabs who frequent it" (ch. xiii. p. 390). The red earth which Captain Beechey observed in this plain is noticed by Herodotus in regard to Libya (ii. 12). Stephan. Byz. also mentions the bricks used in building (v. Βάρκη). Derna, too, to the eastward of Cyrene on the sea-coast, is amply provided with water (ch. xvi. p. 471).

Respecting Kyrênê itself, Captain Beechey states:—"During the time, about a fortnight, of our absence from Cyrene, the changes which had taken place in the appearance of the country about it were remarkable. We found the hills on our return covered with Arabs, their camels, flocks, and herds; the scarcity o. water in the interior at this time having driven the Bedouins to the mountains, and particularly to Cyrene, where the springs afford at all times an abundant supply. The corn was all cut, and the high grass and luxuriant vegetation, which we had found it so difficult to wade through on former occasions, had been eaten down to the roots by the cattle" (ch. xviii. pp. 517, 520).

The winter rains are also abundant, between January and March, at Bengazi (the ancient Hesperides): sweet springs of water are found near the town (ch. xi. pp. 282, 315, 327). About Ptolemeta, or Ptolemais, the port of the ancient Barka, *ib.* ch. xii. p. 363.

[2] Herodot. iv. 170—171. *πα αλία σφό-δρα εὐδαίμων.* Strabo, ii. p. 131, *πολυ-μήλου καὶ πολυκαρποτάτας χθονός*, Pind. Pyth. ix. 7.

[3] Herodot. iv. 186, 187, 189, 190. *Νομάδες κρεοφάγοι καὶ γαλακτοπόται.* Pindar, Pyth. ix. 127, *ἱππευταὶ Νομάδες.* Pompon. Mela, i. 8.

[4] See the fourth, fifth, and ninth Pythian Odes of Pindar. In the description given by Sophoklês (Electra, 695) of the Pythian contest, in which pretence is made that Orestês has perished, ten contending chariots are supposed, of which two are Libyan from Barka: of the remaining eight, one only comes from each place named.

and magnates of Kyrênê and Barka owed the frequent successes of their chariots in the games of Greece. The Libyan Nasamônes, leaving their cattle near the sea, were in the habit of making an annual journey up the country to the Oasis of Augila for the purpose of gathering the date-harvest,[1] or of purchasing dates; and the Bedouin Arabs from Bengazi still make this same journey annually, carrying up their wheat and barley for the same purpose. Each of the Libyan tribes was distinguished by a distinct mode of cutting the hair, and by some peculiarities of religious worship, though generally all worshipped the Sun and the Moon.[2] But in the neighbourhood of the Lake Tritônis (seemingly the western extremity of Grecian coasting trade in the time of Herodotus, who knows little beyond, except from Carthaginian authorities), the Grecian deities Poseidôn and Athênê, together with the legend of Jason and the Argonauts, had been localised. There were moreover current prophecies announcing that one hundred Hellenic cities were destined one day to be founded round the lake—and that one city in the island Phla, surrounded by the lake, was to be planted by the Lacedæmonians.[3] These indeed were among the many unfulfilled prophecies which from every side cheated the Grecian ear, proceeding probably from Kyrenæan or Theræan traders, who thought the spot advantageous for settlement, and circulated their own hopes under the form of divine assurances. It was about the year 510 B.C.[4] that some of the Theræans conducted the Spartan prince Dorieus to found a colony in the fertile region of Kinyps, belonging to the Libyan Makæ. But Carthage, interested in preventing the extension of Greek settlements westward, aided the Libyans in driving him out.

Manners of the Libyan Nomads.

The Libyans in the immediate neighbourhood of Kyrênê were materially changed by the establishment of that town. They constituted a large part—at first probably far the largest part—of its constituent population. Not possessing that fierce tenacity of habits which the Mahomedan religion has impressed upon the Arabs of the present day, they were open to the mingled influence of

Mixture of Greeks and Libyan inhabitants at Kyrênê.

[1] Herodot. iv. 172—182. Compare Hornemann's Travels in Africa, p. 48, and Heeren, Verkehr und Handel der Alten Welt, Th. ii. Abth. 1, Abschnitt vi. p. 226.

[2] Herodot. iv. 175—188.

[3] Herodot. iv. 178, 179, 195, 196.

[4] Herodot. iv. 42.

constraint and seduction applied by Grecian settlers; and in the time of Herodotus, the Kabales and the Asbystæ of the interior had come to copy Kyrenæan tastes and customs.[1] The Theræan colonists, having obtained not merely the consent, but even the guidance, of the natives to their occupation of Kyrênê, constituted themselves like privileged Spartan citizens in the midst of Libyan Periœki.[2] They seem to have married Libyan wives, so that Herodotus describes the women of Kyrênê and Barka as following, even in his time, religious observances indigenous and not Hellenic.[3] Even the descendants of the primitive œkist Battus were semi-Libyan, for Herodotus gives us the curious information that Battus was the Libyan word for a king, and deduces from it the just inference that the name Battus was not originally personal to the œkist, but acquired in Libya first as a title;[4] though it afterwards passed to his descendants as a proper name. For eight generations the reigning princes were called Battus and Arkesilaus, the Libyan denomination alternating with the Greek, until the family was finally deprived of its power. Moreover we find the chief of Barka, kinsman of Arkesilaus of Kyrênê, bearing the name of Alazir, a name certainly not Hellenic, and probably Libyan.[5] We are therefore to conceive the first Theræan colonists as established in their lofty fortified post Kyrênê in the centre of Libyan Periœki, till then strangers to walls, to arts, and perhaps even to cultivated land. Probably these Periœki were always subject and tributary, in a greater or less degree, though they continued for half a century to retain their own king.

Dynasty of Battus at Kyrênê—fresh colonists from Greece.

To these rude men the Theræans communicated the elements of Hellenism and civilization, not without receiving themselves much that was non-Hellenic in return; and perhaps the reactionary influence of the Libyan element against the Hellenic might have proved the stronger of the two, had they not been reinforced by

[1] Herodot. iv. 170. *νόμους δὲ τοὺς πλείστους μιμέεσθαι ἐπιτηδεύουσι τοὺς Κυρηναίων.*

[2] Herodot. iv. 161. *Θηραίων καὶ τῶν περιοίκων*, &c.

[3] Herodot. iv. 186—189. Compare also the story in Pindar, Pyth. ix. 109—126, about Alexidamus, the ancestor of Telesikratês the Kyrenæan; how the former won, by his swiftness in running, a Libyan maiden, daughter of Antæus of Irasa—and Kallimachus, Hymn. Apoll. 86.

[4] Herodot. iv. 155.

[5] Herodot. iv. 164.

new-comers from Greece. After forty years of Battus the Œkist (about 630—590 B.C.) and sixteen years of his son Arkesilaus (about 590—574 B.C.), a second Battus[1] succeeded, called Battus the Prosperous, to mark the extraordinary increase of Kyrênê during his presidency. The Kyrenæans under him took pains to invite new settlers from all parts of Greece without distinction—a circumstance deserving notice in Grecian colonization, which usually manifested a preference for certain races, if it did not positively exclude the rest. To every new-comer was promised a lot of land, and the Delphian priestess strenuously seconded the wishes of the Kyrenæans, proclaiming that "whosoever should reach the place too late for the land division, would have reason to repent it". Such promise of new land, as well as the sanction of the oracle, were doubtless made public at all the games and meetings of Greeks. A large number of new colonists embarked for Kyrênê: the exact number is not mentioned, but we must conceive it to have been very great, when we are told that during the succeeding generation, not less than 7000 Grecian hoplites of Kyrênê perished by the hands of the revolted Libyans—yet leaving both the city itself and its neighbour Barka still powerful. The loss of so great a number as 7000 Grecian hoplites has very few parallels throughout the whole history of Greece. In fact, this second migration, during the government of Battus the Prosperous, which must have taken place between 574—554 B.C., ought to be looked upon as the moment of real and effective colonization for Kyrênê. It was on this occasion probably that the port of Apollonia, which afterwards came to equal the city itself in importance, was first occupied and fortified—for the second swarm of emigrants came by sea direct, while the original colonists had reached Kyrênê by land from the island of Platea through Irasa. The fresh immigrants came from Peloponnêsus, Krête, and some other islands of the Ægean.

To furnish so many new lots of land it was either necessary, or it was found expedient, to dispossess many of the Libyan Perioeki; who found their situation, in other respects also, greatly changed for the worse. The Libyan king Adikran, himself among the sufferers, implored

Disputes with the native Libyans.

[1] Respecting the chronology of the Battiad princes, see Boeckh, ad Pindar. Pyth. iv. p. 265, and Thrige, Histor. Cyrenes, p. 127, *seq*

aid from Apriês king of Egypt, then in the height of his power; sending to declare himself and his people Egyptian subjects, like their neighbours the Adyrmachidæ. The Egyptian prince, accepting the offer, despatched a large military force of the native soldier-caste, who were constantly in station at the western frontier-town Marea, by the route along shore to attack Kyrênê. They were met at Irasa by the Greeks of Kyrênê, and being totally ignorant of Grecian arms and tactics, experienced a defeat so complete that few of them reached home.[1] The consequences of this disaster in Egypt, where it caused the transfer of the throne from Apriês to Amasis, have been noticed in a former chapter.

Of course the Libyan Periœki were put down, and the re-division of lands near Kyrênê among the Greek settlers accomplished, to the great increase of the power of the city. And the reign of Battus the Prosperous marks a flourishing æra in the town, with a large acquisition of land-dominions, antecedent to years of dissension and distress. The Kyrenæans came into intimate alliance with Amasis king of Egypt, who encouraged Grecian connexion in every way, and who even took to wife Ladikê, a woman of the Battiad family at Kyrênê; so that the Libyan Periœki lost all chance of Egyptian aid against the Greeks.[2]

New prospects, however, were opened to them during the reign of Arkesilaus the Second, son of Battus the Prosperous (about 554—544 B.C.). The behaviour of this prince incensed and alienated his own brothers, who raised a revolt against him, seceded with a portion of the citizens, and induced a number of the Libyan Periœki to take part with them. They founded the Greco-Libyan city of Barka, in the territory of the Libyan Auschisæ, about twelve miles from the coast, distant from Kyrênê by sea about seventy miles to the westward. The space between the two, and even beyond Barka as far as the more westerly Grecian colony called Hesperides, was in the days of Skylax provided with commodious ports for refuge or landing.[3] At what time Hesperides was founded we do not know, but it existed about

Arkesilaus the Second prince of Kyrênê—misfortunes of the city—foundation of Barka.

1 Herodot. iv. 159.
2 Herodot. ii. 180—181
3 Herodot. iv. 160; Skylax, c. 107; Hekatæus, Fragm. 300, ed. Klausen.

510 B.C.[1] Whether Arkesilaus obstructed the foundation of Barka is not certain; but he marched the Kyrenæan forces against those revolted Libyans who had joined it. Unable to resist, the latter fled for refuge to their more easterly brethren near the borders of Egypt, and Arkesilaus pursued them. At length, in a district called Leukôn, the fugitives found an opportunity of attacking him at such prodigious advantage, that they almost destroyed the Kyrenæan army; 7000 hoplites (as has been before intimated) being left dead on the field. Arkesilaus did not long survive this disaster. He was strangled during sickness by his brother Learchus, who aspired to the throne; but Eryxô, widow of the deceased prince,[2] avenged the crime by causing Learchus to be assassinated.

That the credit of the Battiad princes was impaired by such a series of disasters and enormities, we can readily believe. But it received a still greater shock from the circumstance, that Battus the Third, son and successor of Arkesilaus, was lame and deformed in his feet. To be governed by a man thus personally disabled, was in the minds of the Kyrenæans an indignity not to be borne, as well as an excuse for pre-existing discontents. The resolution was taken to send to the Delphian oracle for advice. They were directed by the priestess to invite from Mantineia a moderator, empowered to close discussions and provide a scheme of government. The Mantineans selected Demônax, one of the wisest of their citizens, to solve the same problem which had been committed to Solôn at Athens. By his arrangement, the regal prerogative of the Battiad line was terminated, and a republican government established, seemingly about 543 B.C.; the dispossessed prince retaining both the landed domains[3] and the various sacerdotal

Battus the Third—a lame man—reform by Demônax.

[1] Herodot. iv. 204.

[2] Herodot. iv. 160. Plutarch (De Virtutibus Mulier. p. 261) and Polyænus (viii. 41) give various details of this stratagem on the part of Eryxô; Learchus being in love with her. Plutarch also states that Learchus maintained himself as despot for some time by the aid of Egyptian troops from Amasis, and committed great cruelties. His story has too much the air of a romance to be transcribed into the text, nor do I know from what authority it is taken.

[3] Herodot. iv. 161. Τῷ βασιλεῖ Βάττῳ τεμένεα ἐξελὼν καὶ ἱρωσύνας, τὰ ἄλλα πάντα τὰ πρότερον εἶχον οἱ βασιλεῖς ἐς μέσον τῷ δημῷ ἔθηκε.

I construe the word τεμένεα as meaning all the domains, doubtless large, which had belonged to the Battiad princes; contrary to Thrige (Historia Cyrenes, ch. 38, p. 150), who restricts the expression to revenues derived from sacred property. The reference of Wesseling to Hesych.—Βάττου σίλφιον—is of no avail for illustrating this passage.

functions which had belonged to his predecessors. Respecting the government, as newly framed, however, Herodotus unfortunately gives us hardly any particulars. Demônax classified the inhabitants of Kyrênê into three tribes; composed of—1. Theræans with their Libyan Perioeki; 2. Greeks who had come from Peloponnêsus and Krête; 3. such Greeks as had come from all other islands in the Ægean. It appears too that a senate was constituted, taken doubtless from these three tribes, and, we may presume, in equal proportion. It seems probable that there had been before no constitutional classification, nor political privilege, except what was vested in the Theræans—that these latter, the descendants of the original colonists, were the only persons hitherto *known to the constitution*—and that the remaining Greeks, though free landed proprietors and hoplites, were not permitted to act as an integral part of the body politic, nor distributed in tribes at all.[1] The whole powers of government—up to this time vested in the Battiad princes, subject only to such check, how effective we know not, which the citizens of Theræan origin might be able to interpose—were now transferred from the prince to the people, that is, to certain individuals or assemblies chosen somehow from among all the citizens. There existed at Kyrênê, as at Thêra and Sparta, a board of Ephors, and a band of three hundred armed police,[2] analogous to those who were called the Hippeis or Horsemen at Sparta. Whether these were instituted by Demônax we do not know, nor does the identity of titular

The supposition of O. Müller, that the preceding king had made himself despotic by means of Egyptian soldiers, appears to me not probable and not admissible upon the simple authority of Plutarch's romantic story, when we take into consideration the silence of Herodotus. Nor is he correct in affirming that Demônax "restored the supremacy of the community": that legislator superseded the old kingly political privileges, and framed a new constitution (see O. Müller, History of Dorians, b. iii. ch. 9, s. 13).

[1] Both O. Müller (Dor. b. iii. 4, 5) and Thrige (Hist. Cyren. c. 38, p. 148) speak of Demônax as having abolished the old tribes and created new ones. I do not conceive the change in this manner. Demônax did not *abolish* any tribes, but distributed for the first time the inhabitants into tribes. It is possible indeed that before his time the Theræans of Kyrênê may have been divided among themselves into distinct tribes; but the other inhabitants, having immigrated from a great number of different places, had never before been thrown into tribes at all. Some formal enactment or regulation was necessary for this purpose, to define and sanction that religious, social, and political communion which went to make up the idea of the Tribe. It is not to be assumed, as a matter of course, that there must necessarily have been tribes anterior to Demônax, among a population so miscellaneous in its origin.

[2] Hesychius, Τριακάντιοι; Eustath. ad Hom. Odyss. p. 303; Herakleidês Pontic. De Polit. c. 4.

office, in different states, afford safe ground for inferring identity of power. This is particularly to be remarked with regard to the Periœki at Kyrênê, who were perhaps more analogous to the Helots than to the Periœki of Sparta. The fact that the Periœki were considered in the new constitution as belonging specially to the Theræan branch of citizens, shows that these latter still continued a privileged order, like the Patricians with their Clients at Rome in relation to the Plebs.

That the re-arrangement introduced by Demônax was wise, consonant to the general current of Greek feeling, and calculated to work well, there is good reason to believe. No discontent within would have subverted it without the aid of extraneous force. Battus the Lame acquiesced in it peaceably during his life; but his widow and his son, Pheretimê and Arkesilaus, raised a revolt after his death and tried to regain by force the kingly privileges of the family. They were worsted and obliged to flee —the mother to Cyprus, the son to Samos—where both employed themselves in procuring foreign arms to invade and conquer Kyrênê. Though Pheretimê could obtain no effective aid from Euelthôn prince of Salamis in Cyprus, her son was more successful in Samos, by inviting new Greek settlers to Kyrênê, under promise of a redistribution of the land. A large body of emigrants joined him on this proclamation; the period seemingly being favourable to it, since the Ionian cities had not long before become subject to Persia, and were discontented with the yoke. But before he conducted this numerous band against his native city, he thought proper to ask the advice of the Delphian oracle. Success in the undertaking was promised to him, but moderation and mercy after success were emphatically enjoined, on pain of losing his life; and the Battiad race was declared by the god to be destined to rule at Kyrênê for eight generations, but no longer—as far as four princes named Battus and four named Arkesilaus.[1] "More than such eight generations (said the Pythia), Apollo forbids the Battiads even to aim at." This oracle was doubtless told to Herodotus by Kyrenæan informants when he visited their city

New immigration—restoration of the Battiad Arkesilaus the Third.

Oracle limiting the duration of the Battiad dynasty.

1 Herodot. iv. 163. Ἐπὶ μὲν τέσσερας ὑμῖν Λοξίης βασιλεύειν Κυρήνης· πλέον μέντοι τούτου οὐδὲ πειρᾶσθαι παραινέει. Βάττους, καὶ Ἀρκεσιλέως τέσσερας, διδοῖ

after the final deposition of the Battiad princes, which took place in the person of the fourth Arkesilaus, between 460—450 B.C.; the invasion of Kyrênê by Arkesilaus the Third, sixth prince of the Battiad race, to which the oracle professed to refer, having occurred about 530 B.C. The words placed in the mouth of the priestess doubtless date from the later of these two periods, and afford a specimen of the way in which pretended prophecies are not only made up by ante-dating after-knowledge, but are also so contrived as to serve a present purpose; for the distinct prohibition of the god "not even to aim at a longer lineage than eight Battiad princes," seems plainly intended to deter the partisans of the dethroned family from endeavouring to reinstate them.

Violences at Kyrênê under Arkesilaus the Third.

Arkesilaus the Third, to whom this prophecy purports to have been addressed, returned with his mother Pheretimê and his army of new colonists to Kyrênê. He was strong enough to carry all before him—to expel some of his chief opponents and seize upon others, whom he sent to Cyprus to be destroyed; though the vessels were driven out of their course by storms to the peninsula of Knidus, where the inhabitants rescued the prisoners and sent them to Thêra. Other Kyrenæans, opposed to the Battiads, took refuge in a lofty private tower, the property of Aglômachus, wherein Arkesilaus caused them all to be burnt, heaping wood around and setting it on fire. But after this career of triumph and revenge, he became conscious that he had departed from the mildness enjoined to him by the oracle, and sought to avoid the punishment which it had threatened by retiring from Kyrênê. At any rate he departed from Kyrênê to Barka, to the residence of the Barkæan prince his kinsman Alazir, whose daughter he had married. But he found in Barka some of the unfortunate men who had fled from Kyrênê to escape him. These exiles, aided by a few Barkæans, watched for a suitable moment to assail him in the market-place, and slew him together with his kinsman the prince Alazir.[1]

The victory of Arkesilaus at Kyrênê, and his assassination at Barka, are doubtless real facts. But they seem to have been compressed together and incorrectly coloured, in order to give to

[1] Herodot. iv. 163—164.

the death of the Kyrenæan prince the appearance of a divine judgment. For the reign of Arkesilaus cannot have been very short, since events of the utmost importance occurred within it. The Persians under Kambysês conquered Egypt, and both the Kyrenæan and the Barkæan prince sent to Memphis to make their submission to the conqueror—offering presents and imposing upon themselves an annual tribute. These presents of the Kyrenæans, 500 minæ of silver, were considered by Kambysês so contemptibly small, that he took hold of them at once and threw them among his soldiers. And at the moment when Arkesilaus died, Aryandês, the Persian satrap after the death of Kambysês, is found established in Egypt.[1]

Arkesilaus sends his submission to Kambysês king of Persia.

During the absence of Arkesilaus at Barka, his mother Pheretimê had acted as regent, taking her place at the discussions in the senate. But when his death took place, and the feeling against the Battiads manifested itself strongly at Barka, she did not feel powerful enough to put it down, and went to Egypt to solicit aid from Aryandês. The satrap, being made to believe that Arkesilaus had met his death in consequence of steady devotion to the Persians, sent a herald to Barka to demand the men who had slain him. The Barkæans assumed the collective responsibility of the act, saying that he had done them injuries both numerous and severe—a farther proof that his reign cannot have been very short. On receiving this reply, the satrap immediately dispatched a powerful Persian armament, land-force as well as sea-force, in fulfilment of the designs of Pheretimê against Barka. They besieged the town for nine months, trying to storm, to batter, and to undermine the walls;[2] but their efforts were vain, and it was taken at last only by an act of the grossest perfidy. Pretending to relinquish the attempt in despair, the Persian general concluded a treaty with the Barkæans, wherein it was stipulated that the latter should continue to pay tribute to the Great King, but that the army should retire without farther hostilities: "I swear it (said the Persian general), and my oath shall hold good, as long as this

B.C. 517—513.

Persian expedition from Egypt against Barka—Pheretimê mother of Arkesilaus.

[1] Herodot. iii. 13; iv. 165—166.

[2] Polyænus (Strateg. vii. 28) gives a narrative in many respects different from this of Herodotus.

earth shall keep its place". But the spot on which the oaths were exchanged had been fraudulently prepared: a ditch had been excavated and covered with hurdles, upon which again a surface of earth had been laid. The Barkæans, confiding in the oath, and overjoyed at their liberation, immediately opened their gates and relaxed their guard; while the Persians, breaking down the hurdles and letting fall the superimposed earth, so that they might comply with the letter of their oath, assaulted the city and took it without difficulty.

Capture of Barka by perfidy—cruelty of Pheretimê.

Miserable was the fate which Pheretimê had in reserve for these entrapped prisoners. She crucified the chief opponents of herself and her late son around the walls, on which were also affixed the breasts of their wives: then, with the exception of such of the inhabitants as were Battiads and noway concerned in the death of Arkesilaus, she consigned the rest to slavery in Persia. They were carried away captive into the Persian empire, where Darius assigned to them a village in Baktria as their place of abode, which still bore the name of Barka, even in the days of Herodotus.

During the course of this expedition, it appears, the Persian army advanced as far as Hesperides, and reduced many of the Libyan tribes to subjection. These, together with Kyrênê and Barka, figure afterwards among the tributaries and auxiliaries of Xerxês in his expedition against Greece. And when the army returned to Egypt, by order of Aryandês, they were half inclined to seize Kyrênê itself in their way, though the opportunity was missed and the purpose left unaccomplished.[1]

Pheretimê accompanied the retreating army to Egypt, where she died shortly of a loathsome disease, consumed by worms; thus showing (says Herodotus[2]) that "excessive cruelty in revenge brings down upon men the displeasure of the gods". It will be recollected that in the veins of this savage woman the Libyan blood was intermixed with the Grecian. In Greece Proper, political enmity kills—but seldom, if ever, mutilates—or sheds the blood of women.

We thus leave Kyrênê and Barka again subject to Battiad

[1] Herodot. iv. 203, 204.

[2] Herodot. iv. 205.

princes, at the same time that they are tributaries of Persia. Another Battus and another Arkesilaus have to intervene before the glass of this worthless dynasty is run out, between 460—450 B.C. I shall not at present carry the reader's attention to this last Arkesilaus, who stands honoured by two chariot victories in Greece, and two fine odes of Pindar.

Battus the Fourth and Arkesilaus the Fourth—final extinction of the dynasty about 460—450 B.C.

The victory of the third Arkesilaus, and the restoration of the Battiads, broke up the equitable constitution established by Demônax. His triple classification into tribes must have been completely remodelled, though we do not know how; for the number of new colonists whom Arkesilaus introduced must have necessitated a fresh distribution of land, and it is extremely doubtful whether the relation of the Theræan class of citizens with their Periœki, as established by Demônax, still continued to subsist. It is necessary to notice this fact, because the arrangements of Demônax are spoken of by some authors as if they formed the permanent constitution of Kyrênê; whereas they cannot have outlived the restoration of the Battiads, nor can they even have been revived after that dynasty was finally expelled, since the number of new citizens and the large change of property, introduced by Arkesilaus the Third, would render them inapplicable to the subsequent city.

Constitution of Demônax not durable.

# CHAPTER XXVIII.

## PAN-HELLENIC FESTIVALS—OLYMPIC, PYTHIAN, NEMEAN, AND ISTHMIAN.

IN the preceding chapters I have been under the necessity of presenting to the reader a picture altogether incoherent and destitute of central effect. I have specified briefly each of the two or three hundred towns which agreed in bearing the Hellenic name, and recounted its birth and early life, as far as our evidence goes—but without being able to point out any action and reaction, exploits or sufferings, prosperity or misfortune, glory or disgrace, common to all. To a great degree, this is a characteristic inseparable from the history of Greece from its beginning to its end; for the only political unity which it ever receives is the melancholy unity of subjection under all-conquering Rome. Nothing short of force will efface in the mind of a free Greek the idea of his city as an autonomous and separate organization. The village is a fraction, but the city is an unit,—and the highest of all political units, not admitting of being consolidated with others into a ten or a hundred, to the sacrifice of its own separate and individual mark. Such is the character of the race, both in their primitive country and in their colonial settlements—in their early as well as in their late history—splitting by natural fracture into a multitude of self-administering, indivisible cities. But that which marks the early historical period before Peisistratus, and which impresses upon it an incoherence at once so fatiguing and so irremediable, is, that as yet no causes have arisen to counteract this political isolation. Each city, whether progressive or stationary, prudent or adventurous, turbulent or tranquil, follows out its own thread of existence, having no

Want of grouping and unity in the early period of Grecian history.

partnership or common purposes with the rest, nor being yet constrained into any active communion with them by extraneous forces. In like manner, the races which on every side surround the Hellenic world appear distinct and unconnected, not yet taken up into any co-operating mass or system.

Contemporaneously with the accession of Pelsistratus, this state of things becomes altered both in and out of Hellas—the former as a consequence of the latter. For at that time begins the formation of the great Persian empire, which absorbs into itself not only Upper Asia and Asia Minor, but also Phœnicia, Egypt, Thrace, Macedonia, and a considerable number of the Grecian cities themselves; while the common danger, from this vast aggregate, threatening the greater states of Greece Proper, drives them, in spite of great reluctance and jealousy, into active union. Hence arises a new impulse, counterworking the natural tendency to political isolation in the Hellenic cities, and centralising their proceedings to a certain extent for the two centuries succeeding 650 B.C.; Athens and Sparta both availing themselves of the centralising tendencies which had grown out of the Persian war. But during the interval between 776—560 B.C., no such tendency can be traced even in commencement, nor any constraining force calculated to bring it about. Even Thucydidês, as we may see by his excellent preface, knew of nothing during these two centuries except separate city-politics and occasional wars between neighbours. The only event, according to him, in which any considerable number of Grecian cities were jointly concerned, was the war between Chalkis and Eretria, the date of which we do not know. In that war, several cities took part as allies; Samos, among others, with Eretria—Milêtus with Chalkis:[1] how far the alliances of either may have extended, we have no evidence to inform us, but the presumption is that no great number of Grecian cities was comprehended in them. Such as it was, however, this war between Chalkis and Eretria was the nearest approach, and the only approach, to a Pan-Hellenic proceeding, which Thucydidês indicates between the Trojan and the Persian wars. Both he and

**New causes tending to favour union begin after 560 B.C.—no general war between 776 and 560 B.C. known to Thucydidês.**

[1] Thucyd. i. 15.

Herodotus present this early period only by way of preface and contrast to that which follows—when the Pan-Hellenic spirit and tendencies, though never at any time predominant, yet counted for a powerful element in history, and sensibly modified the universal instinct of city-isolation. They tell us little about it, either because they could find no trustworthy informants, or because there was nothing in it to captivate the imagination in the same manner as the Persian or the Peloponnesian wars. From whatever cause their silence arises, it is deeply to be regretted, since the phænomena of the two centuries from 776—560 B.C., though not susceptible of any central grouping, must have presented the most instructive matter for study, had they been preserved. In no period of history have there ever been formed a greater number of new political communities, under much variety of circumstances, personal as well as local. A few chronicles, however destitute of philosophy, reporting the exact march of some of these colonies from their commencement—amidst all the difficulties attendant on amalgation with strange natives, as well as on a fresh distribution of land—would have added greatly to our knowledge both of Greek character and Greek social existence.

Increasing disposition to religious intellectual, and social union

Taking the two centuries now under review, then, it will appear that there is not only no growing political unity among the Grecian states, but a tendency even to the contrary—to dissemination and mutual estrangement. Not so, however, in regard to the other feelings of unity capable of subsisting between men who acknowledge no common political authority—sympathies founded on common religion, language, belief of race, legends, tastes and customs, intellectual appetencies, sense of proportion and artistic excellence, recreative enjoyments, &c. On all these points, the manifestations of Hellenic unity become more and more pronounced and comprehensive, in spite of increased political dissemination, throughout the same period. The breadth of common sentiment and sympathy between Greek and Greek, together with the conception of multitudinous periodical meetings as an indispensable portion of existence, appears decidedly greater in 560 B.C. than it had been a century before. It was fostered by the increased conviction of the

superiority of Greeks as compared with foreigners—a conviction gradually more and more justified as Grecian art and intellect improved, and as the survey of foreign countries became extended—as well as by the many new efforts of men of genius in the field of music, poetry, statuary, and architecture; each of whom touched chords of feeling, belonging to other Greeks hardly less than to his own peculiar city. At the same time, the life of each peculiar city continues distinct, and even gathers to itself a greater abundance of facts and internal interests; so that during the two centuries now under review there was in the mind of every Greek an increase both of the city-feeling and of the Pan-Hellenic feeling, but on the other hand a decline of the old sentiment of separate race—Doric, Ionic, Æolic.

Reciprocal admission of cities to the religious festivals of each other.

I have already, in a former volume, touched upon the many-sided character of the Grecian religion, entering as it did into all the enjoyments and sufferings, the hopes and fears, the affections and antipathies of the people—not simply imposing restraints and obligations, but protecting, multiplying, and diversifying all the social pleasures and all the decorations of existence. Each city and even each village had its peculiar religious festivals, wherein the sacrifices to the gods were usually followed by public recreations of one kind or other—by feasting on the victims, processional marches, singing and dancing, or competition in strong and active exercises. The festival was originally local, but friendship or communion of race was shown by inviting others, non-residents, to partake in its attractions. In the case of a colony and its metropolis, it was a frequent practice that citizens of the metropolis were honoured with a privileged seat at the festivals of the colony, or that one of their number was presented with the first taste of the sacrificial victim.[1] Reciprocal frequentation of religious festivals was thus the standing evidence of friendship and fraternity among cities not politically united. That it must have existed to a certain degree from the earliest

[1] Thucyd. i. 26. See the tale in Pausanias (v. 25, 1) of the ancient chorus sent annually from Messênê in Sicily across the strait to Rhegium, to a local festival of the Rhegians—thirty-five boys with a chorus-master and a flute-player: on one unfortunate occasion all of them perished in crossing. For the Theôry (or solemn religious deputation) periodically sent by the Athenians to Dêlos, see Plutarch, Nicias, c. 3; Plato, Phædôn, c. 1, p. 58. Compare also Strabo, ix. p. 419, on the general subject.

days, there can be no reasonable doubt; though in Homer and Hesiod we find only the celebration of funeral games, by a chief at his own private expense, in honour of his deceased father or friend—with all the accompanying recreations, however, of a public festival, and with strangers not only present, but also contending for valuable prizes.[1] Passing to historical Greece during the seventh century B.C., we find evidence of two festivals, even then very considerable, and frequented by Greeks from many different cities and districts—the festival at Dêlos, in honour of Apollo, the great place of meeting for Ionians throughout the Ægean—and the Olympic games.

Early splendour of the Ionic festival at Dêlos—its decline.

The Homeric Hymn to the Delian Apollo, which must be placed earlier than 600 B.C., dwells with emphasis on the splendour of the Delian festival, unrivalled throughout Greece, as it would appear, during all the first period of this history, for wealth, finery of attire, and variety of exhibitions as well in poetical genius as in bodily activity[2]—equalling probably at that time, if not surpassing, the Olympic games. The complete and undiminished grandeur of this Delian Pan-Ionic festival is one of our chief marks of the first period of Grecian history, before the comparative prostration of the Ionic Greeks through the rise of Persia. It was celebrated periodically in every fourth year, to the honour of Apollo and Artemis. Moreover, it was distinguished from the Olympic games by two circumstances both deserving of notice—first, by including solemn matches not only of gymnastic, but also of musical and poetical excellence, whereas the latter had no place at Olympia; secondly, by the admission of men, women, and children indiscriminately as spectators, whereas women were formally excluded from the Olympic ceremony.[3] Such exclusion may have depended in part on the inland situation of Olympia, less easily approachable by females than the island of Dêlos; but even making allowance for this circumstance, both the one distinction and the other mark the rougher character of the Ætolo-Dorians in Peloponnêsus.

[1] Homer, Iliad, xi. 879, xxiii. 679; Hesiod, Opp. Di. 651.

[2] Homer, Hymn. Apoll. 150; Thucyd. iii. 104.

[3] Pausan. v. 6, 5; Ælian, N. H. x. 1; Thucyd. iii. 104. When Ephesus, and the festival called Ephesia, had become the great place of Ionic meeting, the presence of women was still continued (Dionys. Hal. A. R. iv. 25).

The Delian festival, which greatly dwindled away during the subjection of the Asiatic and insular Greeks to Persia, was revived afterwards by Athens during the period of her empire, when she was seeking in every way to strengthen her central ascendency in the Ægean. But though it continued to be ostentatiously celebrated under her management, it never regained that commanding sanctity and crowded frequentation which we find attested in the Homeric Hymn to Apollo for its earlier period.

Olympic games—their celebrity and long continuance.

Very different was the fate of the Olympic festival—on the banks of the Alpheius[1] in Peloponnêsus, near the old oracular temple of the Olympian Zeus—which not only grew up uninterruptedly from small beginnings to the maximum of Pan-Hellenic importance, but even preserved its crowds of visitors and its celebrity for many centuries after the extinction of Greek freedom, and only received its final abolition, after more than 1100 years of continuance, from the decree of the Christian emperor Theodosius in 394 A.D. I have already recounted in the preceding volume of this History, the attempt made by Pheidôn, despot of Argos, to restore to the Pisatans, or to acquire for himself, the adminstration of this festival—an event which proves the importance of the festival in Peloponnêsus, even so early as 740 B.C. At that time, and for some years afterwards, it seems to have been frequented chiefly, if not exclusively, by the neighbouring inhabitants of Central and Western Peloponnêsus—Spartans, Messenians, Arkadians, Triphylians, Pisatans, Eleians, and Achæans[2]—and it forms an important link connecting the Ætolo-Eleians, and their privileges as Agonothets, to solemnise and preside over it, with Sparta. From the year 720 B.C., we trace positive evidences of the gradual presence of more distant Greeks —Corinthians, Megarians, Bœotians, Athenians, and even Smyrnæans from Asia. We observe also other proofs of growing importance, in the increased number and variety of matches exhibited to the spectators, and in the substitution of the simple crown of olive, an honorary reward, in place of the more sub-

[1] Strabo, viii. p. 353; Pindar, Olymp. viii. 2; Xenophôn, Hellen. iv. 7, 2; iii. 2, 22.

[2] See K. F. Hermann, Lehrbuch der Griechischen Staatsalterthümer, sect. 10.

stantial present which the Olympic festival and all other Grecian festivals began by conferring upon the victor. The humble constitution of the Olympic games presented originally nothing more than a match of runners in the measured course called the Stadium. A continuous series of the victorious runners was formally inscribed and preserved by the Eleians, beginning with Korœbus in 776 B.C., and was made to serve by chronological inquirers from the third century B.C. downwards, as a means of measuring the chronological sequence of Grecian events. It was on the occasion of the seventh Olympiad after Korœbus that Daiklês the Messenian first received for his victory in the Stadium no farther recompense than a wreath from the sacred olive-tree near Olympia:[1] the honour of being proclaimed victor was found sufficient, without any pecuniary addition. But until the fourteenth Olympiad (724 B.C.) there was no other match for the spectators to witness besides that of simple runners in the stadium. On that occasion a second race was first introduced, of runners in the double stadium, or up and down the course. In the next or fifteenth Olympiad (720 B.C.) a third match, the long course for runners, or several times up and down the stadium. There were thus three races—the simple Stadium, the double Stadium or Diaulos, and the long course or Dolichos, all for runners—which continued without addition until the eighteenth Olympiad, when the wrestling-match and the complicated Pentathlon (including jumping, running, the quoit, the javeiin, and wrestling) were both added. A farther novelty appears in the twenty-third Olympiad (688 B.C.), the boxing-match; and another still more important in the twenty-fifth (680 B.C.), the chariot with four full-grown horses. This last mentioned addition is deserving of special notice, not merely as it diversified the scene by the introduction of horses, but also as it brought in a totally new class of competitors—rich men and women, who possessed the finest horses and could hire the most skilful drivers, without any personal superiority or power of

Their gradual increase—new matches introduced.

1 Dionys. Halikarn. Ant. Rom. i. 71; Phlegôn, De Olympiad. p. 140. For an illustration of the stress laid by the Greeks on the purely honorary rewards of Olympia, and on the credit which they took to themselves as competitors, not for money, but for glory, see Herodot. viii. 26. Compare the Scholia on Pindar, Nem. and Isthm. Argument., p. 425—514, ed. Boeckh.

bodily display in themselves.[1] The prodigious exhibition of wealth in which the chariot proprietors indulged is not only an evidence of growing importance in the Olympic games, but also served materially to increase that importance and to heighten the interest of spectators. Two farther matches were added in the thirty-third Olympiad (648 B.C.)—the Pankration, or boxing and wrestling conjoined,[2] with the hand unarmed or divested of that hard leather cestus[3] worn by the pugilist, which rendered the blow of the latter more terrible, but at the same time prevented him from grasping or keeping hold of his adversary—and the single race-horse. Many other novelties were introduced one after the other, which it is unnecessary fully to enumerate—the race between men clothed in full panoply and bearing each his shield—the different matches between boys, analogous to those between full-grown men, and between colts of the same nature as between full-grown horses. At the maximum of its attraction the Olympic solemnity occupied five days, but until the seventy-seventh Olympiad all the various matches had been compressed into one—beginning at day-break and not always closing before dark.[4] The seventy-seventh Olympiad follows immediately after the successful expulsion of the Persian invaders from Greece, when the Pan-Hellenic feeling had been keenly stimulated by resistance to a common enemy: and we may easily conceive that

[1] See the sentiment of Agesilaus, somewhat contemptuous, respecting the chariot-race, as described by Xenophôn (Agesilaus, ix. 6): the general feeling of Greece, however, is more in conformity with what Thucydidês (vi. 16) puts into the mouth of Alkibiadês, and Xenophôn into that of Simonidês (Xenophôn, Hiero, xi. 5). The great respect attached to a family which had gained chariot victories is amply attested: see Herodot. vi. 35, 36, 103, 126—οἰκίη τεθριπποτρόφος—and vi. 70, about Demaratus king of Sparta.

[2] Antholog. Palatin. ix. 588; vol. ii. 299, Jacobs.

[3] The original Greek word for this covering (which surrounded the middle hand and upper portion of the fingers, leaving both the ends of the fingers and the thumb exposed) was ἱμάς, the word for a thong, strap, or whip, of leather: the special word μύρμηξ seems to have been afterwards introduced (Hesychius, v. Ἱμάς): see Homer, Iliad, xxiii. 686. Cestus, or Cæstus, is the Latin word (Virg. Æn. v. 404): the Greek word κεστός is an adjective annexed to ἱμάς—κεστὸν ἱμάντα—πολύκεστος ἱμάς (Iliad, xiv. 214, iii. 371). See Pausan. viii. 40, 3, for the description of the incident which caused an alteration in this hand-covering at the Nemean games: ultimately it was still farther hardened by the addition of iron.

[4] Ἀέθλων πεμπαμέρους ἁμίλλας—Pindar, Olymp. v. 6: compare Schol. ad Pindar. Olymp. iii. 33.

See the facts respecting the Olympic Agôn collected by Corsini (Dissertationes Agonisticæ, Dissert. i., sect. 8, 9, 10), and still more amply set forth, with a valuable commentary, by Krause (Olympia, oder Darstellung der grossen Olympischen Spiele, Wien 1838, sect. 8—11 especially).

this was a suitable moment for imparting additional dignity to the chief national festival.

Olympic festival—the first which passes from a local to a Pan-Hellenic character.

We are thus enabled partially to trace the steps whereby, during the two centuries succeeding 776 B.C., the festival of the Olympic Zeus in the Pisatid gradually passed from a local to a national character, and acquired an attractive force capable of bringing together into temporary union the dispersed fragments of Hellas, from Marseilles to Trebizond. In this important function it did not long stand alone. During the sixth century B.C., three other festivals, at first local, become successively nationalised—the Pythia near Delphi, the Isthmia near Corinth, the Nemea near Kleônæ, between Sikyôn and Argos.

Pythian games or festival.

In regard to the Pythian festival, we find a short notice of the particular incidents and individuals by whom its reconstitution and enlargement were brought about—a notice the more interesting, inasmuch as these very incidents are themselves a manifestation of something like Pan-Hellenic patriotism, standing almost alone in an age which presents little else in operation except distinct city-interests. At the time when the Homeric Hymn to the Delphinian Apollo was composed (probably in the seventh century B.C.), the Pythian festival had as yet acquired little eminence.

Early state and site of Delphi.

The rich and holy temple of Apollo was then purely oracular, established for the purpose of communicating to pious inquirers "the counsels of the Immortals". Multitudes of visitors came to consult it, as well as to sacrifice victims and to deposit costly offerings; but while the god delighted in the sound of the harp as an accompaniment to the singing of Pæans, he was by no means anxious to encourage horse-races and chariot-races in the neighbourhood. Nay, this psalmist considers that the noise of horses would be "a nuisance"—the drinking of mules a desecration to the sacred fountains—and the ostentation of fine-built chariots objectionable,[1] as tending to divert the attention of

[1] Hom. Hymn. Apoll. 262.

Πημανέει σ' αἰεὶ κτυπὸς ἵππων ὠκειάων,
Ἀρδόμενοί τ' οὐρῆες ἐμῶν ἱερῶν ἀπὸ πηγέων.
Ἔνθα τις ἀνθρώπων βουλήσεται ἐσοράασθαι
Ἁρματά τ' εὐποίητα καὶ ὠκυπόδων κτυπὸν ἵππων,
Ἠ νηόν τε μέγαν καὶ κτήματα πόλλ' ἐνεόντα.

Also v. 288—394. γυάλων ὑπὸ Παρνήσσοιο—485. ὑπὸ πτυχὶ Παρνήσσοιο—Pindar,

spectators away from the great temple and its wealth. From such inconveniences the god was protected by placing his sanctuary "in the rocky Pytho"—a rugged and uneven recess, of no great dimensions, embosomed in the southern declivity of Parnassus, and about 2000 feet above the level of the sea, while the topmost Parnassian summits reach a height of near 8000 feet. The situation was extremely imposing, but unsuited by nature for the congregation of any considerable number of spectators—altogether impracticable for chariot-races—and only rendered practicable by later art and outlay for the theatre as well as for the stadium; the original stadium, when first established, was placed in the plain beneath. Such a site furnished little means of subsistence, but the sacrifices and presents of visitors enabled the ministers of the temple to live in abundance,[1] and gathered together by degrees a village around it.

Phokian town of Krissa.

Near the sanctuary of Pytho, and about the same altitude, was situated the ancient Phokian town of Krissa, on a projecting spur of Parnassus—overhung above by the line of rocky precipice called the Phædriades, and itself overhanging below the deep ravine through which flows the river Peistus. On the other side of this river rises the steep mountain Kirphis, which projects southward into the Corinthian Gulf—the river reaching that gulf through the broad Krissæan, or Kirrhæan, plain, which stretches westward nearly to the Lokrian town of Amphissa; a plain for the most part fertile and productive, though least so in its eastern part immediately under the Kirphis, where the seaport Kirrha was placed.[2] The temple,

Pyth. viii. 90. Πυθῶνος ἐν γυάλοις—Strabo, ix. p. 418. πετρωδὲς χωρίον καὶ θεατροειδές—Heliodorus, Æthiop. ii. 26: compare Will. Götte, Das Delphische Orakel (Leipzig 1839), p. 39—42.

[1] Βωμοί μ' ἐφέρβουν, οὐπιών τ' ἀεὶ ξένος, says Iôn (in Euripidês, Iôn, 334) the slave of Apollo, and the verger of his Delphian temple, who waters it from the Kastalian spring, sweeps it with laurel boughs, and keeps off with his bow and arrows the obstrusive birds (Iôn, 105, 143, 154). Whoever reads the description of Professor Ulrichs (Reisen und Forschungen in Griechenland, ch. 7, p. 110) will see that the birds—eagles, vultures, and crows—are quite numerous enough to have been exceedingly troublesome. The whole play of Iôn conveys a lively idea of the Delphian temple and its scenery, with which Euripidês was doubtless familiar.

[2] There is considerable perplexity respecting Krissa and Kirrha, and it still remains a question among scholars whether the two names denote the same place or different places; the former is the opinion of O. Müller (Orchomenos, p. 495). Strabo distinguishes the two, Pausanias identifies them, conceiving no other town to have ever existed except the sea-port (x. 37, 4). Mannert (Geogr. d. Gr. u. Röm. viii. p. 148) follows Strabo, and represents them different.

I consider the latter to be the correct opinion; upon the grounds, and partly also on the careful topographical

the oracle, and the wealth of Pytho belong to the very earliest periods of Grecian antiquity. But the octennial solemnity in honour of the god included at first no other competition except that of bards, who sang each a pæan with the harp. It has been already mentioned, in my preceding volume, that the Amphiktyonic assembly held one of its half-yearly meetings near the temple of Pytho, the other at Thermopylæ.

Kirrha, the sea-port of Krissa.

In those early times when the Homeric Hymn to Apollo was composed, the town of Krissa appears to have been great and powerful, possessing all the broad plain between Parnassus, Kirphis, and the gulf, to which latter it gave its name—and possessing also, what was a property not less valuable, the adjoining sanctuary of Pytho itself, which the Hymn identifies with Krissa, not indicating Delphi as a separate place. The Krissæans doubtless derived great profits from the number of visitors who came to visit Delphi, both by land and by sea, and Kirrha was originally only the name for their seaport. Gradually, however, the port appears to have grown in importance at the expense of the town, just as Apollonia and Ptolemais came to equal Kyrênê and Barka, and as Plymouth Dock has swelled into Devonport; while at the same time the sanctuary of Pytho with its administrators expanded into the town of Delphi, and came to claim an independent existence of its own. The original relations between Krissa, Kirrha, and Delphi were in this manner at length subverted, the first declining

Growth of Delphi and Kirrha—decline of Krissa.

examination, of Professor Ulrichs, who gives an excellent account of the whole scenery of Delphi (Reisen und Forschungen in Griechenland, Bremen, 1840, chapt rs 1, 2, 3). The ruins described by him on the high ground near Kastri, called the Forty Saints, may fairly be considered as the ruins of Krissa; the ruins of Kirrha are on the sea-shore near the mouth of the Pleistus. The plain beneath might without impropriety be called either the Krissæan or the Kirrhæan plain (Herodot. viii. 32; Strabo, ix. p. 419). Though Strabo was right in distinguishing Krissa from Kirrha, and right also in the position of the latter under Kirphis, he conceived incorrectly the situation of Krissa; and his representation that there were two wars—in the first of which Kirrha was destroyed by the Krissæans, while in the second Krissa itself was conquered by the Amphiktyons—is not confirmed by any other authority.

The mere circumstance that Pindar gives us in three separate passages, Κρίσᾳ, Κραισάλου, Κραισάλοις (Isth. ii. 26; Pyth. v. 49, vi. 18), and in five other passages, Κίρρᾳ, Κίρρας, Κίρραθεν (Pyth. iii. 33, vii. 14, viii. 26, x. 24, xi. 20), renders it almost certain that the two names belong to different places, and are not merely two different names for the same place; the poet could not in this case have any metrical reason for varying the denomination, as the metre of the two words is similar.

and the two latter rising The Krissæans found themselves dispossessed of the management of the temple, which passed to the Delphians; as well as of the profits arising from the visitors, whose disbursements went to enrich the inhabitants of Kirrha. Krissa was a primitive city of the Phokian name, and could boast of a place as such in the Homeric Catalogue, so that her loss of importance was not likely to be quietly endured. Moreover, in addition to the above facts, already sufficient in themselves as seeds of quarrel, we are told that the Kirrhæans abused their position as masters of the avenue to the temple by sea, and levied exorbitant tolls on the visitors who landed there—a number constantly increasing from the multiplication of the transmarine colonies, and from the prosperity of those in Italy and Sicily. Besides such offence against the general Grecian public, they had also incurred the enmity of their Phokian neighbours by outrages upon women, Phokian as well as Argeian, who were returning from the temple.[1]

Thus stood the case, apparently, about 595 B.C., when the Amphiktyonic meeting interfered—either prompted by the Phokians, or perhaps on their own spontaneous impulse, out of regard to the temple—to punish the Kirrhæans. After a war of ten years, the first Sacred War in Greece, this object was completely accomplished, by a joint force of Thessalians under Eurylochus, Sikyonians under Kleisthenês, and Athenians under Alkmæôn; the Athenian Solôn being the person who originated and enforced in the Amphiktyonic council the proposition of interference. Kirrha appears to have made a strenuous resistance, until its supplies from the sea were intercepted by the naval force of the Sikyonian Kleisthenês. Even after the town was taken, its inhabitants defended themselves for some time on the heights of Kirphis.[2] At length, however, they were thoroughly subdued.

Insolence of the Kirrhæans punished by the Amphiktyons.

[1] Athenæus, xiii. p. 560; Æschinês cont. Ktesiphont. c. 36, p. 406; Strabo, ix. p. 418. Of the Akragalidæ, or Kraugal idæ, whom Æschinês mentions along with the Kirrhæans as another impious race who dwelt in the neighbourhood of the god—and who were overthrown along with the Kirrhæans—we have no farther information. O. Müller's conjecture would identify them with the Dryopes (Dorians, i. 2, 5, and his Orchomenos, p. 496); Harpokratiôn, v. Κραυγαλλίδαι.

[2] Schol. ad Pindar. Pyth. Introduct.; Schol. ad Pindar. Nem. ix. 2; Plutarch, Solôn, c. 11; Pausan. ii. 9, 6. Pausanias (x. 37, 4) and Polyænus (Strateg. iii. 6) relate a stratagem of Solôn, or of Eurylochus, to poison the water of the Kirrhæans with hellebore.

Their town was destroyed or left to subsist merely as a landing-place; while the whole adjoining plain was consecrated to the Delphian god, whose domains thus touched the sea. Under this sentence, pronounced by the religious feeling of Greece, and sanctified by a solemn oath publicly sworn and inscribed at Delphi, the land was condemned to remain untilled and unplanted, without any species of human care, and serving only for the pasturage of cattle. The latter circumstance was convenient to the temple, inasmuch as it furnished abundance of victims for the pilgrims who landed and came to sacrifice—for without preliminary sacrifice no man could consult the oracle;[1] while the entire prohibition of tillage was the only means of obviating the growth of another troublesome neighbour on the seaboard. The ruin of Kirrha in this war is certain, though the necessity of a harbour for visitors arriving by sea led to the gradual revival of the town upon a humbler scale of pretension. But the fate of Krissa is not so clear, nor do we know whether it was destroyed, or left subsisting in a position of inferiority with regard to Delphi. From this time forward, however, the Delphian community appear as substantive and autonomous, exercising in their own right the management of the temple; though we shall find, on more than one occasion, that the Phokians contest this right, and lay claim to the management of it for themselves[2]—a remnant of that early period when the oracle stood in the domain of the Phokian Krissa. There seems moreover to have been a standing antipathy between the Delphians and the Phokians.

The Sacred War just mentioned—emanating from a solemn Amphiktyonic decree, carried on jointly by troops of different states whom we do not know to have ever before co-operated, and directed exclusively towards an object of common interest—is in itself a fact of high importance as manifesting a decided growth of Pan-Hellenic feeling. Sparta is not named as interfering—a circumstance which seems remarkable when we consider both her power, even as it then stood, and her intimate connexion with the Delphian oracle—while the Athenians appear as the chief movers, through

First Sacred War, in 595 B.C.

[1] Eurip. Iôn, 230.

[2] Thucyd. i. 112.

the greatest and best of their citizens. The credit of a large-minded patriotism rests prominently upon them.

But if this Sacred War itself is a proof that the Pan-Hellenic spirit was growing stronger, the positive result in which it ended reinforced that spirit still farther. The spoils of Kirrha were employed by the victorious allies in founding the Pythian games. The octennial festival hitherto celebrated at Delphi in honour of the god, including no other competition except in the harp and the pæan, was expanded into comprehensive games on the model of the Olympic, with matches not only of music, but also of gymnastics and chariots—celebrated, not at Delphi itself, but on the maritime plain near the ruined Kirrha—and under the direct superintendence of the Amphiktyons themselves. I have already mentioned that Solôn provided large rewards for such Athenians as gained victories in the Olympic and Isthmian games, thereby indicating his sense of the great value of the national games as a means of promoting Hellenic intercommunion. It was the same feeling which instigated the foundation of the new games on the Kirrhæan plain, in commemoration of the vindicated honour of Apollo, and in the territory newly made over to him. They were celebrated in the autumn, or first half of every third Olympic year; the Amphiktyons being the ostensible Agonothets or administrators, and appointing persons to discharge the duty in their names.[1] At the first Pythian ceremony (in 586 B.C.), valuable rewards were given to the different victors; at the second (582 B.C.), nothing was conferred

Destruction of Kirrha —Pythian games founded by the Amphiktyons.

[1] Mr. Clinton thinks that the Pythian games were celebrated in the autumn: M. Boeckh refers the celebration to the spring: Krause agrees with Boeckh (Clinton, Fast. Hell. vol. ii. p. 200, Appendix; Boeckh, ad Corp. Inscr. No. 1688, p. 813; Krause, Die Pythien, Nemeen und Isthmien, vol. ii. p. 29—35).

Mr. Clinton's opinion appears to me the right one. Boeckh admits that, with the exception of Thucydidês (v. 1—19), the other authorities go to sustain it; but he relies on Thucydidês to outweigh them. Now the passage of Thucydidês, properly understood, seems to me as much in favour of Clinton's view as the rest, if not more.

I may remark, as a certain additional reason in favour of Mr. Clinton's view, that the Isthmia appear to have been celebrated in the third year of each Olympiad, and in the spring (Krause, p. 187). It seems improbable that these two great festivals should have come one immediately after the other, which nevertheless must be supposed, if we adopt the opinion of Boeckh and Krause.

Though the Pythian games belong to late summer or early autumn, the exact month is not easy to determine: see the references in K. F. Hermann, Lehrbuch der gottesdienstlichen Alterthümer der Griechen, ch. 49, not. 12.

but wreaths of laurel—the rapidly attained celebrity of the games being such as to render any farther recompense superfluous. The Sikyonian despot Kleisthenês himself, one of the leaders in the conquest of Kirrha, gained the prize at the chariot-race of the second Pythia. We find other great personages in Greece frequently mentioned as competitors, and the games long maintained a dignity second only to the Olympic, over which indeed they had some advantages; first, that they were not abused for the purpose of promoting petty jealousies and antipathies of any administering state, as the Olympic games were perverted by the Eleians, on more than one occasion; next, that they comprised music and poetry as well as bodily display. From the circumstances attending their foundation, the Pythian games deserved, even more than the Olympic, the title bestowed on them by Demosthenês—"the common Agôn of the Greeks".[1]

Nemean and Isthmian games.

The Olympic and Pythian games continued always to be the most venerated solemnities in Greece. Yet the Nemea and Isthmia acquired a celebrity not much inferior; the Olympic prize counting for the highest of all.[2] Both the Nemea and the Isthmia were distinguished from the other two festivals by occurring, not once in four years, but once in two years; the former in the second and fourth years of each Olympiad, the latter in the first and third years. To both is assigned, according to Greek custom, an origin connected with the interesting persons and circumstances of legendary antiquity; but our historical knowledge of both begins with the sixth century B.C. The first historical Nemead is presented as belonging to Olympiad 52 or 53 (572—568 B.C.), a few years subsequent to the Sacred War above-mentioned and to the origin of the Pythia. The festival was celebrated in honour of the Nemean Zeus, in the valley of Nemea between Phlius and Kleônæ. The Kleônæans themselves were originally its presidents, until, at some period after 460 B.C., the Argeians deprived them of that honour and assumed the honours of administration to themselves.[3] The Nemean games had their

[1] Demosthen. Philipp. iii. p. 119.
[2] Pindar, Nem. x. 28—33.
[3] Strab. viii. p. 377; Plutarch, Arat. c. 28; Mannert, Geogr. d. Gr. u. Röm. pt. viii. p. 650. Compare the second chapter in Krause, Die Pythien, Nemeen und Isthmien, vol. ii. p. 108 *seqq.*

That the Kleônæans continued without interruption to administer the

Hellanodikæ[1] to superintend, to keep order, and to distribute the prizes, as well as the Olympic.

Respecting the Isthmian festival, our first historical information is a little earlier, for it has already been stated that Solôn conferred a premium upon every Athenian citizen who gained a prize at that festival as well as at the Olympian—in or after 594 B.C. It was celebrated by the Corinthians at their isthmus, in honour of Poseidôn, and if we may draw any inference from the legends respecting its foundation, which is ascribed sometimes to Thêseus, the Athenians appear to have identified it with the antiquities of their own state.[2]

Nemean festival down to Olympiad 80 (460 B.C.), or thereabouts, is the rational inference from Pindar, Nem. x. 42: compare Nem. iv. 17. Eusebius indeed states that the Argeians seized the administration for themselves in Olympiad 53. In order to reconcile this statement with the above passage in Pindar, critics have concluded that the Argeians lost it again, and that the Kleônæans resumed it a little before Olympiad 80. I take a different view, and am disposed to reject the statement of Eusebius altogether; the more so as Pindar's tenth Nemean ode is addressed to an Argeian citizen named Theiæus; and if there had been at that time a standing dispute between Argos and Kleônæ on the subject of the administration of the Nemea, the poet would hardly have introduced the mention of the Nemean prizes gained by the ancestors of Theiæus, under the untoward designation of "prizes received from Kleônæan men".

[1] See Boeckh, Corp. Inscript. No. 1126.

[2] K. F. Hermann, in his Lehrbuch der Griechischen Staatsalterthümer (ch. 32, not. 7, and ch. 65, not. 3), and again in his more recent work (Lehrbuch der gottesdienstlichen Alterthümer der Griechen, part iii. ch. 49, also not. 6), both highly valuable publications, maintains,—1. That the exaltation of the Isthmian and Nemean games into Pan-Hellenic importance arose directly after and out of the fall of the despots of Corinth and Sikyôn. 2. That it was brought about by the paramount influence of the Dorians, especially by Sparta. 3. That the Spartans put down the despots of both these two cities.

The last of these three propositions appears to me untrue in respect to Sikyôn—improbable in respect to Corinth: my reasons for thinking so have been given in a former chapter. And if this be so, the reason for presuming Spartan intervention as to the Isthmian and Nemean games falls to the ground; for there is no other proof of it, nor does Sparta appear to have interested herself in any of the four national festivals except the Olympic, with which she was from an early period peculiarly connected.

Nor can I think that the first of Hermann's three propositions is at all tenable. No connexion whatever can be shown between Sikyôn and the Nemean games; and it is the more improbable in this case that the Sikyonians should have been active, inasmuch as they had under Kleisthenês a little before contributed to nationalize the Pythian games: a second interference for a similar purpose ought not to be presumed without some evidence. To prove his point about the Isthmia, Hermann cites only a passage of Solinus (vii. 14), "Hoc spectaculum, per Cypselum tyrannum intermissum, Corinthii Olymp. 49 solemnitati pristinæ reddiderunt". To render this passage at all credible, we must read *Cypselidas* instead of *Cypselum* which deducts from the value of a witness whose testimony can never under any circumstances be rated high. But granting the alteration, there are two reasons against the assertion of Solinus. One, a positive reason, that Solôn offered a large reward to Athenian victors at the Isthmian games: his legislation falls in 594 B.C., ten years before the time when the Isthmia are said by Solinus to have been renewed after a long intermission. The

We thus perceive that the interval between 600—560 B.C. exhibits the first historical manifestation of the Pythia, Isthmia, and Nemea—the first expansion of all the three from local into Pan-Hellenic festivals. To the Olympic games, for some time the only great centre of union among all the widely dispersed Greeks, are now added three other sacred Agônes of the like public, open, national character; constituting visible marks as well as tutelary bonds of collective Hellenism, and ensuring to every Greek who went to compete in the matches a safe and inviolate transit even through hostile Hellenic states.[1] These four, all in or near Peloponnêsus, and one of which occurred in each year, formed the Period, or cycle of sacred games, and those who had gained prizes at all the four received the enviable designation of Periodonikês.[2] The honours paid to Olympic victors on their return to their native city were prodigious even in the sixth century B.C., and became even more extravagant afterwards. We may remark, that in the Olympic games alone, the oldest as well as the most illustrious of the four, the musical and intellectual element was wanting. All the three more recent Agônes included crowns for exercises of music and poetry, along with gymnastics, chariots, and horses.

Pan-Hellenic character acquired by all the four festivals—Olympic, Pythian, Nemean, and Isthmian.

It was not only in the distinguishing national stamp set upon these four great festivals that the gradual increase of Hellenic family-feeling exhibited itself, during the course of this earliest period of Grecian history. Pursuant to the same tendencies, religious festivals in all the considerable towns gradually became more and more open and accessible, attracting guests as well as competitors from beyond the border. The comparative dignity

Increased frequentation of the other festivals in most Greek cities.

other reason (negative, though to my mind also powerful) is the silence of Herodotus in that long invective which he puts into the mouth of Sosiklês against the Kypselids (v. 92). If Kypselus had really been guilty of so great an insult to the feelings of the people as to suppress their most solemn festival, the fact would hardly have been omitted in the indictment which Sosiklês is made to urge against him. Aristotle indeed, representing Kypselus as a mild and popular despot, introduces a contrary view of his character, which, if we admitted it, would of itself suffice to negative the supposition that he had suppressed the Isthmia.

[1] Plutarch, Arat. c. 28. *καὶ συνεχύθη τότε πρῶτον* (by order of Aratus) *ἡ δεδομένη τοῖς ἀγωνισταῖς ἀσυλία καὶ ἀσφάλεια*, a deadly stain on the character of Aratus.

[2] Festus, v. Perihodos, p. 217, ed. Müller. See the animated protest of the philosopher Xenophanês against the great rewards given to Olympic victors (540—520 B.C.), Xenophan. Fragment. 2, p. 357, ed. Bergk.

of the city, as well as the honour rendered to the presiding god, were measured by the numbers, admiration, and envy of the frequenting visitors.[1] There is no positive evidence indeed of such expansion in the Attic festivals earlier than the reign of Peisistratus, who first added the quadrennial or greater Panathenæa to the ancient annual or lesser Panathenæa. Nor can we trace the steps of progress in regard to Thêbes, Orchomenus, Thespiæ, Megara, Sikyôn, Pellênê, Ægina, Argos, &c., but we find full reason for believing that such was the general reality. Of the Olympic or Isthmian victors whom Pindar and Simonidês celebrated, many derived a portion of their renown from previous victories acquired at several of these local contests[2]—victories sometimes so numerous, as to prove how wide-spread the habit of reciprocal frequentation had become:[3] though we find, even in the third century B.C., treaties of alliance between different cities, in which it is thought necessary to confer such mutual right by express stipulation. Temptation was offered, to the distinguished gymnastic or musical competitors, by prizes of great value. Timæus even asserted, as a proof of the overweening pride of Krotôn and Sybaris, that these cities tried to supplant the pre-eminence of the Olympic games, by instituting games of their own with the richest prizes to be celebrated at the same time[4]—a statement in itself not worthy of credit, yet nevertheless illustrating the animated rivalry known to prevail among the Grecian cities, in procuring for themselves splendid and crowded games. At the time when the Homeric Hymn to

[1] Thucyd. vi. 16. Alkibiadês says, *καὶ ὅσα αὖ ἐν τῇ πόλει χορηγίαις ἢ ἄλλῳ τῳ λαμπρύνομαι, τοῖς μὲν ἀστοῖς φθονεῖται φύσει, πρὸς δὲ τοὺς ξένους καὶ αὐτη ἰσχὺς φαίνεται.*

The greater Panathenæa are ascribed to Peisistratus by the Scholiast on Aristeidês, vol. iii. p. 323, ed. Dindorf: judging by what immediately precedes, the statement seems to come from Aristotle.

[2] Simonidês, Fragm. 154—158, ed. Bergk; Pindar, Nem. x. 45; Olymp. xiii. 107.

The distinguished athlete Theagenês is affirmed to have gained 1200 prizes in these various agônes: according to some, 1400 prizes (Pausan. vi. 11, 2; Plutarch, Præcept. Reip. Ger. c. 15, p. 811).

An athlete named Apollonius arrived too late for the Olympic games, having stayed away too long from his anxiety to get money at various agônes in Ionia (Pausan. v. 21, 5).

[3] See particularly the treaty between the inhabitants of Latus and those of Olûs in Krête, in Boeckh's Corp. Inscr. No. 2554, wherein this reciprocity is expressly stipulated. Boeckh places this Inscription in the third century B.C.

[4] Timæus, Fragm. 82, ed. Didot. The Krotoniates furnished a great number of victors both to the Olympic and to the Pythian games (Herodot. viii. 47; Pausan. x. 5, 5—x. 7, 3; Krause, Gymnastik und Agonistik der Hellenen, vol. ii. sect. 29, p. 752).

Dêmêtêr was composed, the worship of that goddess seems to have been purely local at Eleusis. But before the Persian war, the festival celebrated by the Athenians every year, in honour of the Eleusinian Dêmêtêr, admitted Greeks of all cities to be initiated, and was attended by vast crowds of them.[1]

All other Greek cities, except Sparta, encouraged such visits.

It was thus that the simplicity and strict local application of the primitive religious festival, among the greater states in Greece, gradually expanded, on certain great occasions periodically recurring, into an elaborate and regulated series of exhibitions—not merely admitting, but soliciting, the fraternal presence of all Hellenic spectators. In this respect Sparta seems to have formed an exception to the remaining states. Her festivals were for herself alone, and her general rudeness towards other Greeks was not materially softened even at the Karneia[2] and Hyakinthia, or Gymnopædiæ. On the other hand, the Attic Dionysia were gradually exalted, from their original rude spontaneous outburst of village feeling in thankfulness to the god, followed by song, dance, and revelry of various kinds—into costly and diversified performances, first by a trained chorus, next by actors superadded to it.[3] And the dramatic compositions thus produced, as they embodied the perfection of Grecian art, so they were eminently calculated to invite a Pan-Hellenic audience and to encourage the sentiment of Hellenic unity. The dramatic literature of Athens however belongs properly to a later period. Previous to the year 560 B.C., we see only those commencements of innovation which drew upon Thespis[4] the rebuke of Solôn; who however

[1] Herodot. viii. 65. καὶ αὐτῶν ὁ βουλόμενος καὶ τῶν ἄλλων Ἑλλήνων μυεῖται.

The exclusion of all competitors natives of Lampsakus, from the games celebrated in the Chersonesus to the honour of the œkist Miltiadês, is mentioned by Herodotus as something special (Herodot. vi. 38).

[2] See the remarks, upon the Lacedæmonian discouragement of stranger-visitors at their public festivals, put by Thucydidês into the mouth of Periklês (Thucyd. ii. 39).

Lichas the Spartan gained great renown by treating hospitably the strangers who came to the Gymnopædiæ at Sparta (Xenophôn, Memorab. i. 2, 61; Plutarch, Kimôn, c. 10)—a story which proves that *some* strangers came to the Spartan festivals, but which also proves that they were not many in number, and that to show them hospitality was a striking distinction from the general character of Spartans.

[3] Aristot. Poetic. c. 3 and 4; Maximus Tyrius, Diss. xxi. p. 215; Plutarch, De Cupidine Divitiarum, c. 8, p. 527: compare the treatise "Quod non potest suaviter vivi secundum Epicurum," c. 16, p. 1098. The old oracles quoted by Demosthenês (cont. Meidiam, c. 15, p. 531, and cont. Makartat. p. 1072: see also Buttmann's note on the former passage) convey the idea of the ancient simple Athenian festival.

[4] Plutarch, Solôn. c. 29: see above, chap. xi. vol. ii. p. 513.

himself contributed to impart to the Panathenaic festival a more solemn and attractive character, by checking the licence of the rhapsodes and ensuring to those present a full orderly recital of the Iliad.

The sacred games and festivals, here alluded to as a class, took hold of the Greek mind by so great a variety of feelings,[1] as to counterbalance in a high degree the political disseverance; and to keep alive among their widespread cities in the midst of constant jealousy and frequent quarrel a feeling of brotherhood and congenial sentiment such as must otherwise have died away. The Theôrs, or sacred envoys who came to Olympia or Delphi from so many different points, all sacrificed to the same god and at the same altar, witnessed the same sports, and contributed by their donatives to enrich or adorn one respected scene. Moreover the festival afforded opportunity for a sort of fair, including much traffic amid so large a mass of spectators;[2] and besides the exhibitions of the games themselves, there were recitations and lectures in a spacious council-room for those who chose to listen to them, by poets, rhapsodes, philosophers, and historians—among which last the history of Herodotus is said to have been publicly read by its author.[3] Of the wealthy and great men in the various cities, many contended simply for the chariot-victories and horse-

Effect of these festivals upon the Greek mind.

[1] The orator Lysias, in a fragment of his lost Panegyrical Oration, preserved by Dionysius of Halikarnassus (vol. v. p. 520 R.), describes the influence of the games with great force and simplicity. Hêraklês, the founder of them, ἀγῶνα μὲν σωμάτων ἐποίησε, φιλοτιμίαν δὲ πλούτῳ, γνώμης δ' ἐπίδειξιν ἐν τῷ καλλίστῳ τῆς Ἑλλάδος. ἵνα τούτων ἁπάντων ἕνεκα ἐς τὸ αὐτὸ ἔλθωμεν, τὰ μὲν ὀψόμενοι, τὰ δὲ ἀκουσόμενοι. Ἠγήσατο γὰρ τὸν ἐνθάδε σύλλογον ἀρχὴν γενέσθαι τοῖς Ἕλλησι τῆς πρὸς ἀλλήλους φιλίας.

[2] Cicero, Tusc. Quæst. v. 3. "*Mercatum* eum, qui haberetur maximo ludorum apparatu totius Græciæ celebritate: nam ut illic alii corporibus exercitatis gloriam et nobilitatem coronæ peterent, alii emendi aut vendendi quæstu et lucro ducerentur," &c.

Both Velleius Paterculus also (i. 8) and Justin (xiii. 5) call the Olympic festival by the name *mercatus*.

There were booths all round the Altis, or sacred precinct of Zeus (Schol. Pindar. Olymp. xi. 55), during the time of the games.

Strabo observes with justice, respecting the multitudinous festivals generally—Ἡ πανήγυρις, ἐμπορικόν τι πρᾶγμα (x. p. 486), especially in reference to Dêlos: see Cicero pro Lege Manilià, c. 18: compare Pausanias, x. 32, 9, about the Panegyris and fair at Tithorea in Phokis, and Becker, Charikles, vol. i. p. 283.

At the Attic festival of the Herakleia, celebrated by the communion called Mesogei, or a certain number of the dêmes constituting Mesogæa, a regular market-due or ἀγοραστικόν was levied upon those who brought goods to sell (Inscriptiones Atticæ nuper repertæ 12, by E. Curtius, p. 3—7).

[3] Pausan. vi. 23, 5; Diodôr. xiv. 109, xv. 7; Lucian, Quomodo Historia sit conscribenda, c. 42. See Krause, Olympia, sect. 29, p. 183—186.

victories. But there were others whose ambition was of a character more strictly personal, and who stripped naked as runners, wrestlers, boxers, or pankratiasts, having gone through the extreme fatigue of a complete previous training. Kylôn, whose unfortunate attempt to usurp the sceptre at Athens has been recounted, had gained the prize in the Olympic stadium: Alexander son of Amyntas, the prince of Macedon, had run for it:[1] the great family of the Diagoridæ at Rhodes, who furnished magistrates and generals to their native city, supplied a still greater number of successful boxers and pankratiasts at Olympia, while other instances also occur of generals named by various cities from the list of successful Olympic gymnasts; and the odes of Pindar, always dearly purchased, attest how many of the great and wealthy were found in that list.[2] The perfect popularity, and equality of persons, at these great games, is a feature not less remarkable than the exact adherence to predetermined rule, and the self-imposed submission of the immense crowd to a handful of servants armed with sticks,[3] who executed the orders of the Eleian Hellanodikæ. The ground upon which the ceremony took place, and even the territory of the administering state, was protected by a "Truce of God" during the month of the festival, the commencement of which was formally announced by heralds sent round to the different states. Treaties of peace between different cities were often formally commemorated by pillars there erected, and the general

[1] Thucyd. i. 120; Herodot. v. 22—71. Eurybatês of Argos (Herodot. vi. 92); Philippus and Phayllus of Krotôn (v. 47; viii. 47); Eualkidês of Eretria (v. 1, 2); Hermolykus of Athens (ix. 105).

Pindar (Nem. iv. and vi.) gives the numerous victories of the Bassidæ and Theandridæ at Ægina: also Melissus the Pankratiast and his ancestors the Kleonymidæ of Thêbes — *τιμάεντες ἀρχάθεν πρόξενοί τ' ἐπιχωρίων* (Isthm. iii. 25).

Respecting the extreme celebrity of Diagoras and his sons, of the Rhodian gens Eratidæ, Damagêtus, Akusilaus, and Dorieus, see Pindar, Olymp. vii. 16—145, with the Scholia; Thucyd. iii. 11; Pausan. vi. 7, 1, 2; Xenophôn, Hellenic. i. 5, 19: compare Strabo, xiv. p. 655.

[2] The Latin writers remark it as a peculiarity of Grecian feeling, as distinguished from Roman, that men of great station accounted it an honour to contend in the games: see, as a specimen, Tacitus, Dialogus de Orator. c. 9. "Ac si in Græciâ natus esses, ubi ludicras quoque artes exercere honestum est, ac tibi Nicostrati robur Dii dedissent, non paterer immanes illos et ad pugnam natos lacertos, levitate jaculi vanescere." Again, Cicero, pro Flacco, c. 12, in his sarcastic style— "Quid si etiam occisus est a piratis Adramyttenus, homo nobilis, cujus est fere nobis omnibus nomen auditum, Atinas pugil, Olympionices? hoc est apud Græcos (quoniam de eorum *gravitate* dicimus) prope majus et gloriosius, quam Romæ triumphasse."

[3] Lichas, one of the chief men of Sparta, and moreover a chariot-victor, received actual chastisement on the ground, from these staff-bearers, for an infringement of the regulations (Thucyd. v. 50).

impression of the scene suggested nothing but ideas of peace and brotherhood among Greeks.[1] And I may remark that the impression of the games as belonging to all Greeks, and to none but Greeks, was stronger and clearer during the interval between 600—300 B.C., than it came to be afterwards. For the Macedonian conquests had the effect of diluting and corrupting Hellenism, by spreading an exterior varnish of Hellenic tastes and manners over a wide area of incongruous foreigners, who were incapable of the real elevation of the Hellenic character; so that although in later times the games continued undiminished both in attraction and in number of visitors, the spirit of Pan-Hellenic communion which had once animated the scene was gone for ever.

[1] Thucyd. v. 18—47, and the curious ancient Inscription in Boeckh's Corpus Inscr., No. 11, p. 28, recording the convention between the Eleians and the inhabitants of the Arcadian town of Heræa.

The comparison of various passages referring to the Olympia, Isthmia, and Nemea (Thucydidês, iii. 11, viii. 9, 10, v. 49—51, and Xenophôn, Hellenic. iv. 7, 2, v. 1, 29) shows that serious political business was often discussed at these games—that diplomatists made use of the intercourse for the purpose of detecting the secret designs of states whom they suspected—and that the administering state often practised manœuvres in respect to the obligations of truce for the Hieromenia or Holy Season.

# CHAPTER XXIX.

## LYRIC POETRY.—THE SEVEN WISE MEN.

THE interval between 776—560 B.C. presents to us a remarkable expansion of Grecian genius in the creation of their elegiac, iambic, lyric, choric, and gnomic poetry, which was diversified in a great many ways and improved by many separate masters. The creators of all these different styles—from Kallinus and Archilochus down to Stesichorus—fall within the two centuries here included; though Pindar and Simonidês, "the proud and high-crested bards,"[1] who carried lyric and choric poetry to the maximum of elaboration consistent with full poetical effect, lived in the succeeding century, and were contemporary with the tragedian Æschylus. The Grecian drama, comic as well as tragic, of the fifth century B.C., combined the lyric and choric song with the living action of iambic dialogue—thus constituting the last ascending movement in the poetical genius of the race. Reserving this for a future time, and for the history of Athens, to which it more particularly belongs, I now propose to speak only of the poetical movement of the two earlier centuries, wherein Athens has little or no part. So scanty are the remnants, unfortunately, of these earlier poets, that we can offer little except criticisms borrowed at second-hand, and a few general considerations on their workings and tendency.[2]

Age and duration of the Greek lyric poetry.

[1] Himerius, Orat. iii. p. 426, Wernsdorf—ἀγέροχοι καὶ ὑψαυχένες.

[2] For the whole subject of this chapter, the eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth chapters of O. Müller's History of the Literature of Ancient Greece, wherein the lyric poets are handled with greater length than consists with the limits of this work, will be found highly valuable—chapters abounding in erudition and ingenuity, but not always within the limits of the evidence.

The learned work of Ulrici (Geschichte der Griechischen Poesie—*Lyrik*) is still more open to the same remark.

Archilochus and Kallinus both appear to fall about the middle of the seventh century B.C., and it is with them that the innovations in Grecian poetry commence. Before them, we are told, there existed nothing but the Epos, or Daktylic Hexameter poetry, of which much has been said in my former volume—being legendary stories or adventures narrated, together with addresses or hymns to the gods. We must recollect, too, that this was not only the whole poetry, but the whole literature of the age. Prose composition was altogether unknown. Writing, if beginning to be employed as an aid to a few superior men, was at any rate generally unused, and found no reading public. The voice was the only communicant, and the ear the only recipient, of all those ideas and feelings which productive minds in the community found themselves impelled to pour out; and both voice and ear were accustomed to a musical recitation or chant, apparently something between song and speech, with simple rhythm and a still simpler occasional accompaniment from the primitive four-stringed harp. Such habits and requirements of the voice and ear were, at that time, inseparably associated with the success and popularity of the poet, and contributed doubtless to restrict the range of subjects with which he could deal. The type was to a certain extent consecrated, like the primitive statues of the gods, from which men only ventured to deviate by gradual and almost unconscious innovations. Moreover, in the first half of the seventh century B.C., that genius which had once created an Iliad and an Odyssey was no longer to be found. The work of hexameter narrative had come to be prosecuted by less gifted persons—by those Cyclic poets of whom I have spoken in the preceding volumes.

Epical age preceding the lyrical.

Such, as far as we can make it out amidst very uncertain evidence, was the state of the Greek mind immediately before elegiac and lyric poets appeared; while at the same time its experience was enlarging by the formation of new colonies, and the communion among various states tending to increase by the freer reciprocity of religious games and festivals. There arose a demand for turning the literature of the age (I use this word as synonymous with the poetry) to new feelings and purposes, and for applying the rich, plastic, and musical

Wider range of subjects for poetry—new metres—enlarged musical scale.

language of the old epic to present passion and circumstance, social as well as individual. Such a tendency had become obvious in Hesiod, even within the range of hexameter verse. Now the same causes which led to an enlargement of the subjects of poetry inclined men also to vary the metre. In regard to this latter point, there is reason to believe that the expansion of Greek music was the immediate determining cause. For it has been already stated that the musical scale and instruments of the Greeks, originally very narrow, were materially enlarged by borrowing from Phrygia and Lydia, and these acquisitions seem to have been first realized about the beginning of the seventh century B.C., through the Lesbian harper Terpander, the Phrygian (or Greco-Phrygian) flute-player Olympus, and the Arkadian or Bœotian flute-player Klonas. Terpander made the important advance of exchanging the original four-stringed harp for one of seven strings, embracing the compass of one octave or two Greek tetrachords; while Olympus as well as Klonas taught many new nomes or tunes on the flute, to which the Greeks had before been strangers—probably also the use of a flute of more varied musical compass. Terpander is said to have gained the prize at the first recorded celebration of the Lacedæmonian festival of the Karneia, in 676 B.C. This is one of the best-ascertained points among the obscure chronology of the seventh century; and there seem grounds for assigning Olympus and Klonas to nearly the same period, a little before Archilochus and Kallinus.[1] To Terpander, Olympus, and

**Improvement of the harp by Terpander —of the flute by Olympus and others.**

[1] These early innovators in Grecian music, rhythm, metre, and poetry, belonging to the seventh century B.C., were very imperfectly known even to those contemporaries of Plato and Aristotle, who tried to get together facts for a consecutive history of music. The treatise of Plutarch, De Musicâ, shows what contradictory statements he found. He quotes from four different authors—Herakleidês, Glaukus, Alexander, and Aristoxenus, who by no means agreed in their series of names and facts. The first three of them blend together mythe and history. The Anagraphê or inscription at Sikyôn, which professed to give a continuous list of such poets and musicians as had contended at the Sikyonian games, began with a large stock of mythical names—Amphiôn, Linus, Pierius, &c. (Plutarch, Music. p. 1132). Some authors, according to Plutarch (p. 1133), made the great chronological mistake of placing Terpander as contemporary with Hippônax; a proof how little of chronological evidence was then accessible.

That Terpander was victor at the Spartan festival of the Karneia in 676 B.C., may have been learnt by Hellanikus from the Spartan registers: the name of the Lesbian harper Perikleitas as having gained the same prize at some subsequent period (Plutarch, De Mus. p. 1133) probably rests on the

Klonas are ascribed the formation of the earliest musical nomes known to the inquiring Greek of later times; to the first, nomes on the harp; to the two latter, on the flute—every nome being the general scheme or basis of which the airs actually performed constituted so many variations, within certain defined limits.[1] Terpander employed his enlarged instrumental power as a new accompaniment to the Homeric poems, as well as to certain epic proœmia or hymns to the gods of his own composition. But he does not seem to have departed from the Hexameter verse and the Daktylic rhythm, to which the new accompaniment was probably not quite suitable: and the idea may thus have been suggested of combining the words also according to new rhythmical and metrical laws.

It is certain, at least, that the age (670—600) immediately succeeding Terpander—comprising Archilochus, Kallinus, Tyrtæus and Alkman, whose relations of time one to another we have no certain means of determining,[2] though Alkman seems to have been the latest—presents a remarkable variety both of new metres and of new rhythms, superinduced upon the previous Daktylic

Archilochus, Kallinus, Tyrtæus, and Alkman—670—600 B.C.

same authority. That Archilochus was rather later than Terpander, and Thalêtas rather later than Archilochus, was the statement of Glaukus (Plutarch, De Mus. p. 1134). Klonas and Polymnêstus are placed later than Terpander; Archilochus later than Klonas: Alkman is said to have mentioned Polymnêstus in one of his songs (p. 1133—1135). It can hardly be true that Terpander gained *four* Pythian prizes, if the festival was octennial prior to its reconstitution by the Amphiktyons (p. 1132). Sakadas gained three Pythian prizes *after* that period, when the festival was quadrennial (p. 1134).

Compare the confused indications in Pollux, iv. 65, 66, 78, 79. The abstract given by Photius of certain parts of the Chrestomathia of Proclus (published in Gaisford's edition of Hephæstiôn, p. 375—389), is extremely valuable, in spite of its brevity and obscurity, about the lyric and choric poetry of Greece.

[1] The difference between Νόμος and Μέλος appears in Plutarch, De Musicâ, p. 1132—Καὶ τὸν Τέρπανδρον, κιθαρῳδικῶν ποιητὴν ὄντα νόμων, κατὰ νόμον ἕκαστον τοῖς ἔπεσι τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τοῖς Ὁμήρου μέλη περιτιθέντα, φδειν ἐν τοῖς ἀγῶσι· ἀποφῆναι δὲ τοῦτον λέγει ὀνόματα πρῶτον τοῖς κιθαρῳδικοῖς νόμοις.

The nomes were not many in number; they went by special names; and there was disagreement of opinion as to the persons who had composed them (Plutarch, Music. p. 1133). They were monodic, not choric—intended to be sung by one person (Aristot. Problem. xix. 15). Herodot. i. 23, about Ariôn and the Nomus Orthius.

[2] Mr. Clinton (Fasti Hellen. ad ann. 671, 665, 644) appears to me noway satisfactory in his chronological arrangement of the poets of this century. I agree with O. Müller (Hist. of Literat. of Ancient Greece, ch. xii. 9) in thinking that he makes Terpander too recent, and Thalêtas too ancient; I also believe both Kallinus and Alkman to have been more recent than the place which Mr. Clinton assigns to them; the epoch of Tyrtæus will depend upon the date which we assign to the second Messenian war.

How very imperfectly the chronology of the poetical names even of the sixth century B.C.—Sappho, Anakreôn, Hip-

Hexameter. The first departure from this latter is found in the elegiac verse, employed seemingly more or less by all the four above-mentioned poets, but chiefly by the first two, and even ascribed by some to the invention of Kallinus. Tyrtæus in his military march songs employed the Anapæstic metre, while in Archilochus as well as in Alkman we find traces of a much larger range of metrical variety—Iambic, Trochaic, Anapæstic, Ionic, &c.—sometimes even asynartetic or compound metres, Anapæstic or Daktylic blended with Trochaic or Iambic. What we have remaining from Mimnermus, who comes shortly after the preceding four, is elegiac. His contemporaries Alkæus and Sappho, besides employing most of those metres which they found existing, invented each a peculiar stanza, which is familiarly known under a name derived from each. In Solôn, the younger contemporary of Mimnermus, we have the elegaic, iambic, and trochaic: in Theognis, yet later, the elegiac only. Ariôn and Stesichorus appear to have been innovators in this department, the former by his improvement in the dithyrambic chorus or circular song and dance in honour of Dionysus—the latter by his more elaborate choric compositions, containing not only a strophê and antistrophê, but also a third division or epode succeeding them, pronounced by the chorus standing still. Both Anakreôn and Ibykus likewise added to the stock of existing metrical varieties. We thus see that within the century and a half succeeding Terpander, Greek poetry (or Greek literature, which was then the same thing) became greatly enriched in matter as well as diversified in form.

To a certain extent there seems to have been a real connexion between the two. New forms were essential for the expression of new wants and feelings—though the assertion that elegiac metre is especially adapted for one set of feelings,[1] trochaic for a

pônax—was known to writers of the beginning of the Ptolemaic age (or shortly after 300 B.C.), we may see by the mistakes noted in Athenæus, xiii. p. 599. Hermesianax of Kolophôn, the elegiac poet, represented Anakreôn as the lover of Sappho; this might perhaps be not absolutely impossible, if we supposed in Sappho an old age like that of Ninon de l'Enclos; but others (even earlier than Hermesianax, since they are quoted by Chamæleôn) represented Anakreôn, when in old age, as addressing verses to Sappho still young. Again, the comic writer Diphilus introduced both Archilochus and Hippônax as the lovers of Sappho.

[1] The Latin poets and the Alexandrine critics seem to have both insisted on the natural mournfulness of the elegiac metre (Ovid. Heroid. xv. 5; Horat. Art. Poet. 75): see also the

second, and iambic for a third, if true at all, can only be admitted with great latitude of exception, when we find so many of them employed by the poets for very different subjects—gay or melancholy, bitter or complaining, earnest or sprightly—seemingly with little discrimination. But the adoption of some new metre, different from the perpetual series of hexameters, was required when the poet desired to do something more than recount a long story or fragment of heroic legend—when he sought to bring himself, his friends, his enemies, his city, his hopes and fears with regard to matters recent or impending, all before the notice of the hearer, and that too at once with brevity and animation. The Greek hexameter, like our blank verse, has all its limiting conditions bearing upon each separate line, and presents to the hearer no predetermined resting-place, or natural pause beyond.[1] In reference to any long composition, either epic and dramatic, such unrestrained licence is found convenient, and the case was similar for Greek epos and drama—the single-lined Iambic Trimeter being generally used for the dialogue of tragedy and comedy, just as the Daktylic Hexameter had been used for the epic. The metrical changes introduced by Archilochus and his contemporaries may be compared to a change from our blank verse to the rhymed couplet and quatrain. The verse was thrown into little systems of two, three, or four lines, with a pause at the end of each; and the halt thus assured to, as well as expected and relished by, the ear, was generally coincident with a close, entire or partial, in the sense, which thus came to be distributed with greater point and effect.

New metres superadded to the Hexameter —Elegiac, Iambic, Trochaic.

fanciful explanation given by Didymus in the Etymologicon Magnum, v. Ἔλεγος.

We learn from Hephæstiôn (c. viii. p. 45, Gaisf.) that the Anapæstic marchmetre of Tyrtæus was employed by the comic writers also, for a totally different vein of feeling. See the Dissertation of Franck, Callinus, p. 37—48 (Lips. 1816).

Of the remarks made by O. Müller respecting the metres of these early poets (History of the Literature of Ancient Greece, ch. xi. s. 8—12, &c.; ch. xii. s. 1, 2, &c.), many appear to me uncertified and disputable.

For some good remarks on the fallibility of men's impressions respecting the natural and inherent ἦθος of particular metres, see Adam Smith (Theory of Moral Sentiment, Part v. ch. i. p. 329), in the edition of his works by Dugald Stewart.

[1] See the observations in Aristotle (Rhetor. iii. 9) on the λέξις εἰρομένη as compared with λέξις κατεστραμμένη·—λέξις εἰρομένη, ἣ οὐδὲν ἔχει τέλος αὐτὴ καθ' αὑτήν, ἂν μὴ τὸ πρᾶγμα τὸ λεγόμενον τελειώθη·—κατεστραμμένη δὲ, ἡ ἐν περιόδοις· λέγω δὲ περίοδον, λέξιν ἔχουσαν ἀρχὴν καὶ τελευτὴν αὐτὴ καθ' αὑτὴν καὶ μέγεθος εὐσύνοπτον.

The elegiac verse, or common Hexameter and Pentameter (this second line being an hexameter with the third and sixth thesis,[1] or the last half of the third and sixth foot suppressed, and a pause left in place of it), as well as the Epode (or Iambic Trimeter followed by an Iambic Dimeter) and some other binary combinations of verse which we trace among the fragments of Archilochus, are conceived with a view to such increase of effect both on the ear and the mind, not less than to the direct pleasures of novelty and variety. The Iambic metre, built upon the primitive Iambus or coarse and licentious jesting[2] which formed a part of some Grecian festivals (especially of the festivals of Dêmêtêr as well in Attica as in Paros, the native country of the poet), is only one amongst many new paths struck out by this inventive genius. His exuberance astonishes us, when we consider that he takes his start from little more than the simple Hexameter,[3] in which too he was a distinguished composer

Archilochus.

[1] I employ, however unwillingly, the word *thesis* here (arsis and thesis) in the sense in which it is used by G. Hermann ("Illud tempus, in quo ictus est, *arsin;* ea tempora, quæ carent ictu, *thesin* vocamus," Element. Doctr. Metr. sect. 15), and followed by Boeckh, in his Dissertation on the Metres of Pindar (i. 4), though I agree with Dr. Barham (in the valuable Preface to his edition of Hephæstiôn, Cambridge, 1843, pp. 5—8) that the opposite sense of the words would be the preferable one, just as it was the original sense in which they were used by the best Greek musical writers: Dr. Barham's Preface is very instructive on the difficult subject of ancient rhythm generally.

[2] Homer, Hymn. ad Cererem, 202; Hesychius, v. Γεφυρίς; Herodot. v. 83; Diodôr. v. 4. There were various gods at whose festivals scurrility (*τωθασμός*) was a consecrated practice, seemingly different festivals in different places (Aristot. Politic. vii. 15, 8).

The reader will understand better what this consecrated scurrility means by comparing the description of a modern traveller in the kingdom of Naples (Tour through the Southern Provinces of the kingdom of Naples, by Mr. Keppel Craven, London, 1821, ch. xv. p. 287):—

"I returned to Gerace (the site of the ancient Epizephyrian Lokri) by one of those moonlights which are known only in these latitudes, and which no pen or pencil can portray. My path lay along some corn-fields, in which the natives were employed in the last labours of the harvest, and I was not a little surprised to find myself saluted with a volley of opprobrious epithets and abusive language, uttered in the most threatening voice, and accompanied with the most insulting gestures. This extraordinary custom is of the most remote antiquity, and is observed towards all strangers during the harvest and vintage seasons; those who are apprised of it will keep their temper as well as their presence of mind, as the loss of either would only serve as a signal for still louder invectives, and prolong a contest in which success would be as hopeless as undesirable."

[3] The chief evidence for the rhythmical and metrical changes introduced by Archilochus is to be found in the 28th chapter of Plutarch, De Musicâ, p. 1140—1141, in words very difficult to understand completely. See Ulrici, Geschichte der Hellenisch. Poesie, vol. ii. p. 381.

The epigram ascribed to Theokritus (No. 18 in Gaisford's Poetæ Minores) shows that the poet had before him Hexameter compositions of Archilochus, as well as lyric—

*ὡς ἐμμελής τ' ἔγεντο κἀπιδέξιος*
*ἔπεά τε ποιεῖν, πρὸς λύραν τ' ἀείδειν.*

See the article on Archilochus in

—for even of the elegiac verse he is as likely to have been the inventor as Kallinus, just as he was the earliest popular and successful composer of table-songs or Skolia, though Terpander may have originated some such before him. The entire loss of his poems, excepting some few fragments, enables us to recognise little more than one characteristic—the intense personality which pervaded them, as well as that coarse, direct, and outspoken licence, which afterwards lent such terrible effect to the old comedy at Athens. His lampoons are said to have driven Lykambês, the father of Neobulê, to hang himself. Neobulê had been promised to Archilochus in marriage, but that promise was broken, and the poet assailed both father and daughter with every species of calumny.[1] In addition to this disappointment, he was poor, the son of a slave-mother, and an exile from his country Paros to the unpromising colony of Thasos. The desultory notices respecting him betray a state of suffering combined with loose conduct which vented itself sometimes in complaint, sometimes in libellous assault. He was at last slain by some whom his muse had thus exasperated. His extraordinary poetical genius finds but one voice of encomium throughout antiquity. His triumphal song to Hêraklês was still popularly sung by the victors at Olympia, near two centuries after his death, in the days of Pindar; but that majestic and complimentary poet at once denounces the malignity, and attests the retributive suffering, of the great Parian iambist.[2]

Amidst the multifarious veins in which Archilochus displayed his genius, moralising or gnomic poetry is not wanting; while his contemporary Simonidês of Amorgos devotes the Iambic metre especially to this destination, afterwards followed out by Solôn and Theognis. Kallinus, the earliest celebrated elegiac poet, so far as we can judge from his few fragments, employed the elegiac metre for exhortations of warlike patriotism; and the more ample remains which we possess of

Simonidês of Amorgos, Kallinus, Tyrtæus.

Welcker's Kleine Schriften, p. 71—82, which has the merit of showing that Iambic bitterness is far from being the only marked feature in his character and genius.

[1] See Meleager, Epigram. cxix. 3, Horat. Epist. 19, 23, and Epod. vi. 13, with the Scholiast; Ælian, V. H. x. 13.

[2] Pindar, Pyth. ii. 55; Olymp. ix. 1, with the Scholia; Euripid. Hercul. Furens, 583—683. The eighteenth epigram of Theokritus (above alluded to) conveys a striking tribute of admiration to Archilochus: compare Quintilian, x. 1, and Liebel, ad Archilochi Fragmenta, sect. 5, 6, 7.

Tyrtæus are sermons in the same strain, preaching to the Spartans bravery against the foe, and unanimity as well as obedience to the law at home. They are patriotic effusions called forth by the circumstances of the time, and sung by single voice, with accompaniment of the flute,[1] to those in whose bosoms the flame of courage was to be kindled. For though what we peruse is in verse, we are still in the tide of real and present life, and we must suppose ourselves rather listening to an orator addressing the citizens when danger or dissension is actually impending. It is only in the hands of Mimnermus that elegiac verse comes to be devoted to soft and amatory subjects. His few fragments present a vein of passive and tender sentiment, illustrated by appropriate matter of legend, such as would be cast into poetry in all ages, and quite different from the rhetoric of Kallinus and Tyrtæus.

Musical and poetical tendencies at Sparta.

The poetical career of Alkman is again distinct from that of any of his above-mentioned contemporaries. Their compositions, besides hymns to the gods, were principally expressions of feeling intended to be sung by individuals, though sometimes also suited for the Kômus or band of festive volunteers, assembled on some occasion of common interest: those of Alkman were principally choric, intended for the song and accompanying dance of the chorus. He was a native of Sardis in Lydia, or at least his family were so: and he appears to have come in early life to Sparta, though his genius and mastery of the Greek language discountenance the story that he was brought over to Sparta as a slave. The most ancient arrangement of music at Sparta, generally ascribed to Terpander,[2] underwent considerable alteration, not only through the elegiac and anapæstic measures of Tyrtæus, but also through the Kretan Thalêtas and the Lydian Alkman. The harp, the instrument of Terpander, was rivalled and in part superseded by the flute or pipe, which had been recently rendered more effective in the hands of Olympus, Klonas, and Polymnêstus, and which gradually became, for compositions intended to raise strong emotion, the favourite instrument of the two—being employed as accompani-

1 Athenæus, xiv. p. 630.

2 Plutarch, De Musicâ, pp. 1134, 1135; Aristotle, De Lacedæmon. Republicâ, Fragm. xi. p. 132, ed. Neumann; Plutarch, De Serâ Numin. Vindict. c. 13, p. 558.

ment both to the elegies of Tyrtæus, and to the hyporchemata (songs or hymns combined with dancing) of Thalêtas; also, as the stimulus and regulator to the Spartan military march.[1] These elegies (as has been just remarked) were sung by one person in the midst of an assembly of listeners, and there were doubtless other compositions intended for the individual voice. But in general such was not the character of music and poetry at Sparta; everything done there, both serious and recreative, was public and collective, so that the chorus and its performance received extraordinary development.

It has been already stated, that the chorus, with song and dance combined, constituted an important part of divine service throughout all Greece. It was originally a public manifestation of the citizens generally—a large proportion of them being actively engaged in it,[2] and receiving some training for the purpose as an ordinary branch of education. Neither the song nor the dance under such conditions could be otherwise than extremely simple. But in process of time, the performance at the chief festival tended to become more elaborate and to fall into the hands of persons expressly and professionally trained—the mass of the citizens gradually ceasing to take active part, and being present merely as spectators. Such was the practice which grew up in most parts of Greece, and especially at Athens, where the dramatic chorus acquired its highest perfection. But the drama never found admission at Sparta, and the peculiarity of Spartan life tended much to keep up the popular chorus on its ancient footing. It formed in fact one element in that never-ceasing drill to which the Spartans were subject from their

[1] Thucyd. v. 69—70, with the Scholia—*μετὰ τῶν πολεμικῶν νόμων . . . . Λακεδαιμόνιοι δὲ βραδέως καὶ ὑπὸ αὐλητῶν πολλῶν νόμῳ ἐγκαθεστώτων, οὐ τοῦ θείου χάριν, ἀλλ' ἵνα ὁμαλῶς μετὰ ῥυθμοῦ βαίνοιεν, καὶ μὴ διασπασθείη αὐτοῖς ἡ τάξις.*

Cicero, Tuscul. Qu. ii. 16. "Spartiatarum quorum procedit Mora ad tibiam, neque adhibetur ulla sine anapæstis pedibus hortatio."

The flute was also the instrument appropriated to Kômus, or the excited movement of half-intoxicated revellers (Hesiod, Scut. Hercul. 80; Athenæ, xiv. p. 617—618).

[2] Plato, Legg. vii. p. 803. *θύοντα καὶ ᾄδοντα καὶ ὀρχούμενον, ὥστε τοὺς μὲν θεοὺς ἱλέως αὐτῷ παρασκευάζειν δυνατὸν εἶναι*, &c.; compare p. 799; Maximus Tyr. Diss. xxxvii. 4; Aristophan. Ran. 950—975; Athenæus, xiv. p. 626; Polyb. iv. 30; Lucian, De Saltatione, c. 10, 11, 16, 31.

Compare Aristotle (Problem. xix. 15) about the primitive character and subsequent change of the chorus; and the last chapter of the eighth book of his Politica: also a striking passage in Plutarch (De Cupidine Divitiarum, c. 8, p. 527) about the transformation of the Dionysiac festival at Chæroneia from simplicity to costliness.

boyhood, and it served a purpose analogous to their military training, in accustoming them to simultaneous and regulated movement—insomuch that the comparison between the chorus, especially in its Pyrrhic or war-dances, and the military enômoty, seems to have been often dwelt upon.[1] In the singing of the solemn pæan in honour of Apollo, at the festival of the Hyakinthia, king Agesilaus was under the orders of the chorus-master, and sang in the place allotted to him;[2] while the whole body of Spartans without exception—the old, the middle-aged, and the youth, the matrons and the virgins—were distributed in various choric companies,[3] and trained to harmony both of voice and motion, which was publicly exhibited at the solemnities of the Gymnopædia. The word *dancing* must be understood in a larger sense than that in which it is now employed, and as comprising every variety of rhythmical, accentuated, conspiring movements, or gesticulations, or postures of the body, from the slowest to the quickest;[4] cheironomy, or the decorous and expressive movement of the hands, being especially practised.

We see thus that both at Sparta and in Krête (which approached in respect to publicity of individual life most nearly to Sparta) the choric aptitudes and manifestations occupied a larger space than in any other Grecian city. And as a certain degree of musical and rhythmical variety was essential to meet this want,[5] while music was never taught to Spartan citizens individually, we farther understand how strangers like Terpander, Polymnêstus,

[1] Athenæus, xiv. p. 628; Suidas, vol. iii. p. 715, ed. Kuster; Plutarch, Instituta Laconica, c. 32—κωμῳδίας καὶ τραγῳδίας οὐκ ἠρώωντο, ὅπως μήτε ἐν σπουδῇ, μήτε ἐν παιδιᾷ, ἀκούωσι τῶν ἀντιλεγόντων τοῖς νόμοις—which exactly corresponds with the ethical view implied in the alleged conversation between Solôn and Thespis (Plutarch, Solôn, c. 29: see above, chap. xi. vol. II. p. 513), and with Plato, Legg. vii. p. 817.

[2] Xenophôn, Agesilaus, ii. 17. οἵκαδε ἀπελθὼν εἰς τὰ Ὑακίνθια, ὅπου ἐτάχθη ὑπὸ τοῦ χοροποιοῦ, τὸν παιᾶνα τῷ θεῷ συνεπετέλει.

[3] Plutarch, Lycurg. c. 14, 16, 21; Athenæus, xiv. p. 631—632, xv. p. 678; Xenophôn, Hellen. vi. 4, 15; De Republic. Lacedæm. ix. 5; Pindar, Hyporchemata, Fragm. 78, ed. Bergk. Ἀάκαινα μὲν παρθένων ἀγέλα.

Also Alkman, Fragm. 13, ed. Bergk; Antigon. Caryst. Hist. Mirab. c. 27.

[4] How extensively pantomimic the ancient orchêsis was, may be seen by the example in Xenophôn, Symposion, vii. 5, ix. 3—6, and Plutarch, Symposion, ix. 15, 2: see K. F. Hermann, Lehrbuch der gottesdienstlichen Alterthümer der Griechen, ch. 29.

"Sane ut in religionibus saltaretur, hæc ratio est: quod nullam majores nostri partem corporis esse voluerunt, quæ non sentiret religionem: nam cantus ad animum, saltatio ad mobilitatem corporis pertinet." (Servius ad Virgil. Eclog. v. 73.)

[5] Aristot. Politic. viii. 4, 6. Οἱ Λάκωνες—οὐ μανθάνοντες ὅμως δύνανται κρίνειν ὀρθῶς, ὥς φασι, τὰ χρηστὰ καὶ τὰ μὴ τῶν μέλων.

Thalêtas, Tyrtæus, Alkman, &c., were not only received, but acquired great influence at Sparta, in spite of the preponderant spirit of jealous seclusion in the Spartan character. All these masters appear to have been effective in their own special vocation—the training of the chorus—to which they imparted new rhythmical action, and for which they composed new music. But Alkman did this, and something more. He possessed the genius of a poet, and his compositions were read afterwards with pleasure by those who could not hear them sung or see them danced. In the little of his poems which remains we recognise that variety of rhythm and metre for which he was celebrated. In this respect he (together with the Kretan Thalêtas, who is said to have introduced a more vehement style both of music and dance, with the Kretic and Pæonic rhythm, into Sparta[1]) surpassed Archilochus, preparing the way for the complicated choric movements of Stesichorus and Pindar. Some of his fragments, too, manifest that fresh outpouring of individual sentiment and emotion which constitutes so much of the charm of popular poetry. Besides his touching address in old age to the Spartan virgins, over whose song and dance he had been accustomed to preside, he is not afraid to speak of his hearty appetite, satisfied with simple food and relishing a bowl of warm broth at the winter tropic.[2] He has attached to the spring an epithet, which comes home to the real feelings of a poor country more than those captivating pictures which abound in verse, ancient as well as modern. He calls it "the season of short fare"—the crop of the previous year being then nearly consumed, the husbandman is compelled to pinch

Choric training—Alkman, Thalêtas.

[1] Homer, Hymn. Apoll. 340. Οἵοί τε Κρητῶν παιήονες, &c.: see Boeckh, De Metris Pindari, ii. 7, p. 143; Ephorus ap. Strabo. x. p. 480; Plutarch, De Musicâ, p. 1132.

Respecting Thalêtas, and the gradual alterations in the character of music at Sparta, Hoeck has given much instructive matter (Kreta, vol. iii. p. 340—377). Respecting Nymphæus of Kydonia, whom Ælian (V. H. xii. 50) puts in juxtaposition with Thalêtas and Terpander, nothing is known.

After what is called the second fashion of music (κατάστασις) had thus been introduced by Thalêtas and his contemporaries—the first fashion being that of Terpander—no farther innovations were allowed. The ephors employed violent means to prohibit the intended innovations of Phrynis and Timotheus, after the Persian war: see Plutarch, Agis, c. 10.

[2] Alkman, Fragm. 13—17, ed. Bergk, ὁ πάμφαγος Ἀλκμάν: compare Fr. 63. Aristides calls him ὁ τῶν παρθένων ἐπαινέτης καὶ σύμβουλος (Or. xlv. vol. ii. p. 40, Dindorf).

Of the Partheneia of Alkman (songs, hymns, and dances, composed for a chorus of maidens) there were at least two books (Stephanus Byzant. v. Ἐρυσίχη). He was the earliest poet who acquired renown in this species of

himself until his new harvest comes in.[1] Those who recollect that in earlier periods of our history, and in all countries where there is little accumulated stock, an exorbitant difference is often experienced in the price of corn before and after the harvest, will feel the justice of Alkman's description.

Judging from these and from a few other fragments of this poet, Alkman appears to have combined the life and exciting vigour of Archilochus in the song properly so called, sung by himself individually—with a larger knowledge of musical and rhythmical effect in regard to the choric performance. He composed in the Laconian dialect—a variety of the Doric with some intermixture of Æolisms. And it was from him, jointly with those other composers who figured at Sparta during the century after Terpander, as well as from the simultaneous development of the choric muse[2] in Argos, Sikyôn, Arcadia, and other parts of Peloponnêsus, that the Doric dialect acquired permanent footing in Greece, as the only proper dialect for choric compositions. Continued by Stesichorus and Pindar, this habit passed even to the Attic dramatists, whose choric songs are thus in a great measure Doric, while their dialogue is Attic. At Sparta, as well as in other parts of Peloponnêsus,[3] the musical and rhythmical style appears to have been fixed by Alkman and his contemporaries, and to have been tenaciously maintained, for two or three centuries, with little or no innovation: the more so, as the flute-players at Sparta formed an hereditary profession, who followed the routine of their fathers.[4]

Doric dialect employed in the choric compositions.

Alkman was the last poet who addressed himself to the popular chorus. Both Ariôn and Stesichorus composed for a body of trained men, with a degree of variety and involution such as

composition, afterwards much pursued by Pindar, Bacchylidês, and Simonidês of Keôs; see Welcker, Alkman. Fragment. p. 10.

[1] Alkman. Frag. 64, ed. Bergk.

Ὥρας δ' ἐσήκε τρεῖς, θέρος
Καὶ χεῖμα κ' ὠπώραν τρίταν·
Καὶ τέτρατον τὸ ἦρ, ὅκα
Σάλλει μὲν, ἐσθίειν δ' ἄδαν
Οὐκ ἐστί.

[2] Plutarch, De Musicâ, c. 9, p. 1134. About the dialect of Alkman, see Ahrens, De Dialecto Æolicâ, sect. 2, 4; about his different metres, Welcker, Alkman. Fragm. p. 10—12.

[3] Plutarch, De Musicâ, c. 32, p. 1142, c. 37, p. 1144; Athenæus, xiv. p. 632. In Krête also, the popularity of the primitive musical composers was maintained, though along with the innovator Timotheus: see Inscription No. 3053, ap. Boeckh, Corp. Inscr.

[4] Herodot. vi. 60. They were probably a γένος with an heroic progenitor, like the heralds, to whom the historian compares them.

could not be attained by a mere fraction of the people. The primitive Dithyrambus was a round choric dance and song in honour of Dionysus,[1] common to Naxos, Thêbes, and seemingly to many other places, at the Dionysiac festival—a spontaneous effusion of drunken men in the hour of revelry, wherein the poet Archilochus "with the thunder of wine full upon his mind," had often taken the chief part.[2] Its exciting character approached to the worship of the Great Mother in Asia, and stood in contrast with the solemn and stately pæan addressed to Apollo. Ariôn introduced into it an alteration such as Archilochus had himself brought about in the scurrilous Iambus. He converted it into an elaborate composition in honour of the god, sung and danced by a chorus of fifty persons, not only sober, but trained with great strictness; though its rhythm and movements, and its equipment in the character of satyrs, presented more or less an imitation of the primitive licence. Born at Methymna in Lesbos, Ariôn appears as a harper, singer, and composer, much favoured by Periander at Corinth, in which city, he first "composed, denominated, and taught the Dithyramb," earlier than any one known to Herodotus.[3] He did not, however, remain permanently there, but travelled from city to city exhibiting at the festivals for money,—especially to Sicilian and Italian Greece, where he acquired large gains. We may here again remark how the poets as well as the festivals served to promote a sentiment of unity among the dispersed Greeks. Such transfer of the Dithyramb, from the field of spontaneous nature into the garden of art,[4] constitutes the first stage in the refinement of Dionysiac worship; which will hereafter be found still farther exalted in the form of the Attic drama.

Ariôn and Stesichorus —substitution of the professional in place of the popular chorus.

The date of Ariôn seems about 600 B.C., shortly after Alkman:

[1] Pindar, Fragm. 44, ed. Bergk, Schol. ad Pindar. Olymp. xiii. 25; Proclus, Chrestomathia, c. 12—14, ad calc. Hephæst. Gaisf. p. 382: compare W. M. Schmidt, In Dithyrambum Poetarumque Dithyrambicorum Reliquias, pp. 171—183 (Berlin, 1845).

[2] Archiloch. Fragm. 72, ed. Bergk.

Ὡς Διωνύσου ἄνακτος καλὸν ἐξάρξαι μέλος
Οἶδα διθύραμβον, οἴνῳ ξυγκεραυνωθεὶς φρένας.

The old oracle quoted in Demosthen. cont. Meidiam, about the Dionysia at Athens, enjoins—Διονύσῳ δημοτελῆ ἱερὰ τελεῖν, καὶ κρατῆρα κεράσαι, καὶ χοροὺς ἱστάναι.

[3] Herodot. i. 23; Suidas, v. Ἀρίων; Pindar, Olymp. xiii. 25.

[4] Aristot. Poetic. c. 6. ἐγένησαν τὴν ποίησιν ἐκ τῶν αὐτοσχεδιασμάτων; again, to the same effect, *ibid.* c. 9.

that of Stesichorus is a few years later. To the latter the Greek chorus owed a high degree of improvement, and in particular the final distribution of its performance into the Strophê, the Antistrophê, and the Epôdus: the turn, the return, and the rest. The rhythm and metre of the song during each strophê corresponded with that during the antistrophê, but was varied during the epôdus, and again varied during the following strophês. Until this time the song had been monostrophic, consisting of nothing more than one uniform stanza, repeated from the beginning to the end of the composition ;[1] so that we may easily see how vast was the new complication and difficulty introduced by Stesichorus—not less for the performers than for the composer, himself at that time the teacher and trainer of performers. Both this poet and his contemporary the flute-player Sakadas of Argos, —who gained the prize at the first three Pythian games founded after the Sacred War,—seem to have surpassed their predecessors in the breadth of subject which they embraced, borrowing from the inexhaustible province of ancient legend, and expanding the choric song into a well-sustained epical narrative.[2] Indeed these Pythian games opened a new career to musical composers just at the time when Sparta began to be closed against musical novelties.

Distribution of the chorus by Stesichorus —Strophê— Antistrophê —Epôdus.

Alkæus and Sappho, both natives of Lesbos, appear about contemporaries with Ariôn B.C. 610—580. Of their once celebrated lyric compositions, scarcely anything remains. But the criticisms which are preserved on both of

Alkæus and Sappho.

[1] Alkman slightly departed from this rule: in one of his compositions of fourteen strophês, the last seven were in a different metre from the first seven (Hephæstion, c. xv. p. 134, Gaisf.; Hermann, Elementa Doctrin. Metricæ, c. xvii. sect. 595). Ἀλκμανικὴ καινοτομία καὶ Στησιχόρειος (Plutarch, De Musicâ, p. 1135).

[2] Pausanias, vi. 14, 4; x. 7, 3. Sakadas, as well as Stesichorus, composed an Ἴλιον πέρσις (Athenæus, xiii. p. 609).

"Stesichorum (observes Quintilian, x. 1) quam sit ingenio validus, materiæ quoque ostendunt, maxima bella et clarissimos canentem duces, et epici carminis onera lyrâ sustinentem. Reddit enim personis in agendo simul loquendoque debitam dignitatem: ac si tenuisset modum, videtur æmulari proximus Homerum potuisse: sed redundat, atque effunditur: quod, ut est reprehendendum, ita copiæ vitium est."

Simonidês of Keôs (Frag. 19, ed. Bergk) puts Homer and Stesichorus together: see the epigram of Antipater in the Anthologia, t. i. p. 328, ed. Jacobs, and Dio Chrysostom, Or. 55, vol. ii. p. 284, Reisk. Compare Kleine, Stesichori Fragment. p. 30—34 (Berlin, 1828), and O. Müller, History of the Literature of Ancient Greece, ch. xiv. sect. 5.

The musical composers of Argos are affirmed by Herodotus to have been the most renowned in Greece, half a century after Sakadas (Her. iii. 131).

them place them in strong contrast with Alkman, who lived and composed under the more restrictive atmosphere of Sparta—and in considerable analogy with the turbulent vehemence of Archilochus,[1] though without his intense private malignity. Both Alkæus and Sappho composed for their own local audience, and in their own Lesbian Æolic dialect; not because there was any peculiar fitness in that dialect to express their vein of sentiment, but because it was more familiar to their hearers. Sappho herself boasts of the pre-eminence of the Lesbian bards;[2] and the celebrity of Terpander, Perikleitas, and Arion permits us to suppose that there may have been before her other popular bards in the island who did not attain to a wide Hellenic celebrity. Alkæus included in his songs the fiercest bursts of political feeling, the stirring alternations of war and exile, and all the ardent relish of a susceptible man for wine and love.[3] The love-song seems to have formed the principal theme of Sappho, who, however, also composed odes or songs[4] on a great variety of other subjects, serious as well as satirical, and is said farther to have first employed the Myxolydian mode in music. It displays the tendency of the age to metrical and rhythmical novelty, that Alkæus and Sappho are said to have each invented the peculiar stanza, well-known under their respective names—combinations of the dactyl, trochee, and iambus, analogous to the asynartetic

[1] Horat. Epistol. i. 19, 23.

[2] Sappho, Fragm. 93, ed. Bergk. See also Plehn, Lesbiaca, pp. 145—165. Respecting the poetesses, two or three of whom were noted, contemporary with Sappho, see Ulrici, Gesch. der Hellen. Poesie, vol. ii. p. 370.

[3] Dionys. Hal. Ant. Rom. v. 82; Horat. Od. i. 32; Cicero, De Nat. Deor. i. 28; the striking passage in Plutarch, Symposion, iii. 1, 3, ap. Bergk. Fragm. 42. In the view of Dionysius, the Æolic dialect of Alkæus and Sappho diminished the value of their compositions: the Æolic accent, analogous to the Latin, and acknowledging scarcely any oxyton words, must have rendered them much less agreeable in recitation or song.

[4] See Plutarch, De Music. p. 1130; Dionys. Hal. de Comp. Verb. c. 23, p. 173, Reisk., and some striking passages of Himerius, in respect to Sappho (i. 4, 16, 19; Maximus Tyrius, Dissert. xxiv. 7—9), and the encomium of the critical Dionysius (De Compos. Verborum, c. 23, p. 173).

The author of the Parian marble adopts as one of his chronological epochs (Epoch 37) the flight of Sappho, or exile, from Mitylênê to Sicily, somewhere between 604—596 B.C. There probably was something remarkable which induced him to single out this event; but we do not know what, nor can we trust the hints suggested by Ovid (Heroid. xv. 51).

Nine books of Sappho's songs were collected by the later literary Greeks, arranged chiefly according to the metres (B. F. Neue, Sapphonis Fragment. p. 11, Berlin, 1827). There were ten books of the songs of Alkæus (Athenæus, xi. p. 481), and both Aristophanês (Grammaticus) and Aristarchus published editions of them (Hephæstion, c. xv. p. 134, Gaisf.). Dikæarchus wrote a commentary upon his songs (Athenæus, xi. p. 461).

verses of Archilochus. They by no means confined themselves however to Alkaic and Sapphic metre. Both the one and the other composed hymns to the gods; indeed this is a theme common to all the lyric and choric poets, whatever may be their peculiarities in other ways. Most of their compositions were songs for the single voice, not for the chorus. The poetry of Alkæus is the more worthy of note, as it is the earliest instance of the employment of the Muse in actual political warfare, and shows the increased hold which that motive was acquiring on the Grecian mind.

Gnomic or moralising poets.

The gnomic poets, or moralists in verse, approach by the tone of their sentiments more to the nature of prose. They begin with Simonidês of Amorgos or of Samos, the contemporary of Archilochus. Indeed Archilochus himself devoted some compositions to the illustrative fable, which had not been unknown even to Hesiod. In the remains of Simonidês of Amorgos we trace nothing relative to the man personally, though he too, like Archilochus, is said to have had an individual enemy, Orodœkidês, whose character was aspersed by his Muse.[1] His only considerable poem extant is devoted to a survey of the characters of women, in iambic verse, and by way of comparison with various animals—the mare, the ass, the bee, &c. This poem follows out the Hesiodic vein respecting the social and economical mischief usually caused by women, with some few honourable exceptions. But the poet shows a much larger range of observation and illustration, if we compare him with his predecessor Hesiod; moreover his illustrations come fresh from life and reality. We find in this early iambist the same sympathy with industry and its due rewards, which is observable in Hesiod, together with a still more melancholy sense of the uncertainty of human events.

Solôn and Theognis.

Of Solôn and Theognis I have spoken in former chapters. They reproduce in part the moralising vein of Simonidês, though with a strong admixture of personal feeling and a direct application to passing events. The mixture of political with social morality, which we find in both, marks their more advanced age: Solôn bears in this respect the

[1] Welcker, Simonidis Amorgini Iambi qui supersunt, p. 9.

same relation to Simonidês as his contemporary Alkæus bears to Archilochus. His poems, as far as we can judge by the fragments remaining, appear to have been short occasional effusions, with the exception of the epic poem respecting the submerged island of Atlantis, which he began towards the close of his life, but never finished. They are elegiac, trimeter iambic, and trochaic tetrameter: in his hands certainly neither of these metres can be said to have any special or separate character. If the poems of Solôn are short, those of Theognis are much shorter, and are indeed so much broken (as they stand in our present collection), as to read like separate epigrams or bursts of feeling, which the poet had not taken the trouble to incorporate in any definite scheme or series. They form a singular mixture of maxim and passion—of general precept with personal affection towards the youth Kyrnus—which surprises us if tried by the standard of literary composition, but which seems a very genuine manifestation of an impoverished exile's complaints and restlessness. What remains to us of Phokylidês, another of the gnomic poets nearly contemporary with Solôn, is nothing more than a few maxims in verse—couplets with the name of the author in several cases embodied in them.

Amidst all the variety of rhythmical and metrical innovations which have been enumerated, the ancient epic continued to be recited by the rhapsodes as before. Some new epical compositions were added to the existing stock: Eugammôn of Kyrênê, about the 50th Olympiad (580 B.C.), appears to be the last of the series. At Athens, especially, both Solôn and Peisistratus manifested great solicitude as well for the recitation as for the correct preservation of the Iliad. Perhaps its popularity may have been diminished by the competition of so much lyric and choric poetry, more showy and striking in its accompaniments, as well as more changeful in its rhythmical character. Whatever secondary effect, however, this newer species of poetry may have derived from such helps, its primary effect was produced by real intellectual or poetical excellence—by the thoughts, sentiment, and expression, not by the accompaniment. For a long time the musical composer and the poet continued generally to be one and the same person; and besides those who have acquired

Subordination of musical and orchestrical accompaniment to the words and meaning.

sufficient distinction to reach posterity, we cannot doubt that there were many known only to their own contemporaries. But with all of them the instrument and the melody constituted only the inferior part of that which was known by the name of *music*—altogether subordinate to the "thoughts that breathe and words that burn".[1] Exactness and variety of rhythmical pronunciation gave to the words their full effect upon a delicate ear; but such pleasure of the ear was ancillary to the emotion of mind arising out of the sense conveyed. Complaints are made by the poets, even so early as 500 B.C., that the accompaniment was becoming too prominent. But it was not until the age of the comic poet Aristophanês, towards the end of the fifth century B.C., that the primitive relation between the instrumental accompaniment and the words was really reversed—and loud were the complaints to which it gave rise.[2] The performance of the flute or harp then became more elaborate, showy, and overpowering, while the words were so put together as to show off the player's execution. I notice briefly this subsequent revolution for the purpose of setting forth, by contrast, the truly intellectual character of the original lyric and choric poetry of Greece, and of showing how much the vague sentiment arising from mere musical sound was lost in the more definite emotion, and in the more lasting and reproductive combinations, generated by political meaning.

Seven Wise Men.

The name and poetry of Solôn, and the short maxims or sayings of Phokylidês, conduct us to the mention of the Seven Wise Men of Greece. Solôn was himself one of the seven, and most, if not all, of them were poets or composers in

[1] Aristophan. Nubes, 536.

Ἀλλ' αὐτῇ καὶ τοῖς ἔπεσιν πιστεύουσ' ἐλήλυθεν.

[2] See Pratinas ap. Athenæum, xiv. p. 617, also p. 636, and the striking fragment of the lost comic poet Pherekratês, in Plutarch, de Musicâ, p. 1141, containing the bitter remonstrance of *Music* (Μουσική) against the wrong which she had suffered from the dithyrambist Melanippidês: compare also Aristophanês, Nubes, 951—972; Athenæus, xiv. p. 617; Horat. Art. Poetic. 205; and W. M. Schmidt, Diatribê in Dithyrambum, ch. viii. p. 250—265.

Τὸ σοβαρὸν καὶ περιττόν—the character of the newer music (Plutarch, Agis, c. 10)—as contrasted with τὸ σεμνὸν καὶ ἀπερίεργον of the old music (Plutarch, De Musicâ, *ut sup.*): ostentation and affected display, against seriousness and simplicity. It is by no means certain that these reproaches against the more recent music of the Greeks were well-founded; we may well be rendered mistrustful of their accuracy when we hear similar remarks and contrasts advanced with regard to the music of the last three centuries. The character of Greek poetry certainly tended to degenerate after Euripidês.

verse.[1] To most of them is ascribed also an abundance of pithy repartees, together with one short saying or maxim peculiar to each, serving as a sort of distinctive motto.[2] Indeed the test of an accomplished man about this time was his talent for singing or reciting poetry, and for making smart and ready answers. Respecting this constellation of Wise Men—who in the next century of Grecian history, when philosophy came to be a matter of discussion and argumentation, were spoken of with great eulogy —all the statements are confused, in part even contradictory. Neither the number, nor the names, are given by all authors alike. Dikæarchus numbered ten, Hermippus seventeen: the names of Solôn the Athenian, Thalês the Milesian, Pittakus the Mitylenean, and Bias the Prienean, were comprised in all the lists—and the remaining names as given by Plato[3] were, Kleobulus of Lindus in Rhodes, Mysôn of Chênæ, and Cheilôn of Sparta. We cannot certainly distribute among them the sayings or mottoes, upon which in later days the Amphiktyons conferred the honour of inscription in the Delphian temple—Know thyself—Nothing too much—Know thy opportunity—Suretyship is the precursor of ruin. Bias is praised as an excellent judge: while Mysôn was declared by the Delphian oracle to be the most discreet man among the Greeks, according to the testimony of the satirical poet Hippônax—this is the oldest testimony (540 B.C.) which can be produced in favour of any of the Seven. But Kleobulus of Lindus, far from being universally extolled, is pronounced by the poet Simonidês to be a fool.[4]

Dikæarchus, however, justly observed that these Seven or Ten

[1] Bias of Priênê composed a poem of 2000 verses on the condition of Ionia (Diogen. Laërt. i. 85), from which perhaps Herodotus may have derived (either directly or indirectly) the judicious advice which he ascribes to that philosopher on the occasion of the first Persian conquest of Ionia (Herod. i. 170).

Not merely Xenophanês the philosopher (Diogen. Laërt. viii. 36, ix. 20), but long after him Parmenidês and Empedoklês, composed in verse.

[2] See the account given by Herodotus (vi. 128—129) of the way in which Kleisthenês of Sikyôn tested the comparative education (παίδευσις) of the various suitors who came to woo his daughter—οἱ δὲ μνήστηρες ἦριν εἶχον ἀμφί τε μουσικῇ καὶ τῷ λεγομένῳ ἐς τὸ μέσον.

[3] Plato, Protagoras, c. 28, p. 343.

[4] Hippônax, Fragm. 77, 34, ed. Bergk —καὶ δικάσασθαι Βίαντος τοῦ Πριηνέος κρείττων.

. . . . . Καὶ Μύσων, ὃν ὁ 'πολλῶν
Ἀνεῖπεν ἀνδρῶν σωφρονέστατον πάντων.

Simonidês, Fr. 6, ed. Bergk—μωροῦ φωτὸς ἅδε βουλά. Diogen. Laërt. i. 6, 2.

Simonidês treats Pittakus with more respect, though questioning an opinion delivered by him (Fragm. 8, ed. Bergk; Plato, Protagoras, c. 26, p. 339).

persons were not Wise Men or Philosophers, in the sense which those words bore in his day, but persons of practical discernment in reference to man and society[1]—of the same turn of mind as their contemporary the fabulist Æsop, though not employing the same mode of illustration. Their appearance forms an epoch in Grecian history, inasmuch as they are the first persons who ever acquired an Hellenic reputation grounded on mental competency apart from poetical genius or effect—a proof that political and social prudence was beginning to be appreciated and admired on its own account. Solôn, Pittakus, Bias, and Thalês were all men of influence—the first two even men of ascendency[2] in their respective cities. Kleobulus was despot of Lindus, and Periander (by some numbered among the seven) of Corinth. Thalês stands distinguished as the earliest name in physical philosophy, with which the other contemporary Wise Men are not said to have meddled. Their celebrity rests upon moral, social, and political wisdom exclusively, which came into greater honour as the ethical feeling of the Greeks improved and as their experience became enlarged.

They were the first men who acquired an Hellenic reputation, without poetical genius.

In these celebrated names we have social philosophy in its early and infantine state—in the shape of homely sayings or admonitions, either supposed to be self-evident, or to rest upon some great authority divine or human, but neither accompanied by reasons nor recognising any appeal to inquiry and discussion as the proper test of their rectitude. From such incurious acquiescence, the sentiment to which these admonitions owe their force, we are partially liberated even in the poet Simonidês of Keôs, who (as before alluded to) severely criticises the song of Kleobulus as well as its author. The half-century which followed the age of Simonidês (the interval between about 480—430 B.C.) broke down that sentiment more and more, by familiarising the public with argumentative controversy in the public assembly, the popular

Early manifestation of philosophy in the form of maxims.

Subsequent growth of dialectics and discussion.

[1] Dikæarchus ap. Diogen. Laërt. i. 40. συνετοὺς καὶ νομοθετικοὺς δεινότητα πολιτικὴν καὶ δραστήριον σύνεσιν. Plutarch, Themistoklês, c. 2.

About the story of the tripod, which is said to have gone the round of these seven wise men, see Menage ad Diogen. Laërt. i. 28, p. 17.

[2] Cicero, De Republ. i. 7; Plutarch, in Delph. p. 385; Bernhardy, Grundriss der Griechischen Litteratur, vol. i. sect. 66, not. 3.

judicature, and even on the dramatic stage. And the increased self-working of the Grecian mind, thus created, manifested itself in Sokratês, who laid open all ethical and social doctrines to the scrutiny of reason, and who first awakened among his countrymen that love of dialectics which never left them—an analytical interest in the mental process of inquiring out, verifying, proving and expounding truth. To this capital item of human progress, secured through the Greeks—and through them only—to mankind generally, our attention will be called at a later period of the history. At present it is only mentioned in contrast with the naked, dogmatical, laconism of the Seven Wise Men, and with the simple enforcement of the early poets—a state in which morality has a certain place in the feelings, but no root, even among the superior minds, in the conscious exercise of reason.

Increase of the habit of writing—commencement of prose compositions.

The interval between Archilochus and Solôn (660—580 B.C.) seems, as has been remarked in my former volume, to be the period in which writing first came to be applied to Greek poems—to the Homeric poems among the number; and shortly after the end of that period, commences the æra of compositions without metre or prose. The philosopher Pherekydês of Syros, about 550 B.C., is called by some the earliest prose-writer. But no prose-writer for a considerable time afterwards acquired any celebrity—seemingly none earlier than Hekatæus of Milêtus,[1] about 510—490 B.C.—prose being a subordinate and ineffective species of composition, not always even perspicuous, and requiring no small practice before the power was acquired of rendering it interesting.[2] Down to the generation preceding Sokratês, the poets continued to be the grand leaders of the Greek mind. Until then, nothing was taught to youth except to read, to remember, to recite musically and rhythmically, and to comprehend, poetical composition. The comments of preceptors addressed to their pupils may probably have become fuller and more instructive, but the text still continued to be epic or lyric poetry. These were the best masters for acquiring a full command of the complicated accent

[1] Pliny, H. N. vii. 57. Suidas v. Ἑκαταῖος.

[2] H. Ritter (Geschichte der Philosophie, ch. vi. p. 243) has some good remarks on the difficulty and obscurity of the early Greek prose-writers, in reference to the darkness of expression and meaning universally charged upon the philosopher Herakleitus.

and rhythm of the Greek language, so essential to an educated man in ancient times, and so sure to be detected if not properly acquired. Not to mention the Choliambist Hippônax, who seems to have been possessed with the devil of Archilochus, and in part also with his genius—Anakreôn, Ibykus, Pindar, Bacchylidês, Simonidês, and the dramatists of Athens, continue the line of eminent poets without intermission. After the Persian war, the requirements of public speaking created a class of rhetorical teachers, while the gradual spread of physical philosophy widened the range of instruction; so that prose composition, for speech or for writing, occupied a larger and larger share of the attention of men, and was gradually wrought up to high perfection, such as we see for the first time in Herodotus. But before it became thus improved, and acquired that style which was the condition of wide-spread popularity, we may be sure that it had been silently used as a means of recording information, and that neither the large mass of geographical matter contained in the Periêgêsis of Hekatæus, nor the map first prepared by his contemporary Anaximander, could have been presented to the world, without the previous labours of unpretending prose writers, who set down the mere results of their own experience. The acquisition of prose-writing, commencing as it does about the age of Peisistratus, is not less remarkable as an evidence of past than as a means of future progress.

First beginnings of Grecian art.

Of that splendid genius in sculpture and architecture, which shone forth in Greece after the Persian invasion, the first lineaments only are discoverable between 600—560 B.C., in Corinth, Ægina, Samos, Chios, Ephesus, &c.—enough however to give evidence of improvement and progress. Glaukus of Chios is said to have discovered the art of welding iron, and Rhœkus or his son Theodôrus of Samos the art of casting copper or brass in a mould. Both these discoveries, as far as can be made out, appear to date a little before 600 B.C.[1]

[1] See O. Müller, Archäologie der Kunst, sect. 61; Sillig, Catalogus Artificum—under Theodôrus and Teleklês.

Thiersch (Epochen der Bildenden Kunst, p. 182—190, 2nd edit.) places Rhœkus near the beginning of the recorded Olympiads, and supposes two artists named Theodôrus, one the grandson of the other; but this seems to me not sustained by any adequate authority (for the loose chronology of Pliny about the Samian school o

The primitive memorial erected in honour of a god did not even pretend to be an image, but was often nothing more than a pillar, a board, a shapeless stone, a post, &c., fixed so as to mark and consecrate the locality, and receiving from the neighbourhood respectful care and decoration as well as worship. Sometimes there was a real statue, though of the rudest character, carved in wood; and the families of carvers—who from father to son exercised this profession, represented in Attica by the name of Dædalus and in Ægina by the name of Smilis—adhered long with strict exactness to the consecrated type of each particular god. Gradually the wish grew up to change the material, as well as to correct the rudeness, of such primitive idols. Sometimes the original wood was retained as the material, but covered in part with ivory or gold; in other cases marble or metal was substituted. Dipœnus and Skyllis of Krête acquired renown as workers in marble about the 50th Olympiad (580 B.C.). From them downwards, a series of names may be traced, more or less distinguished; moreover it seems about the same period that the earliest temple offerings, in works of art properly so called, commence—the golden statue of Zeus, and the large carved chest, dedicated by the Kypselids of Corinth at Olympia.[1] The pious associations, however, connected with the old type were so strong, that the hand of the artist was greatly restrained in dealing with statues of the gods. It was in statues of men, especially in those of the victors at Olympia and other

Restricted character of early art, from religious associations.

artists is not more trustworthy than about the Chian school—compare xxxv. 12, and xxxvi. 3), and moreover intrinsically improbable. Herodotus (i. 51) speaks of "*the* Samian Theodôrus," and seems to have known only one person so called; Diodôrus (i. 98) and Pausanias (x. 38, 3) give different accounts of Theodôrus, but the positive evidence does not enable us to verify the genealogies either of Thiersch or O. Müller. Herodotus (iv. 152) mentions the Ἡραῖον at Samos in connexion with events near Olymp. 37; but this does not prove that the great temple which he himself saw, a century and a half later, had been begun before Olymp. 37, as Thiersch would infer. The statement of O. Müller, that this temple was begun in Olymp. 35, is not authenticated (Arch. der Kunst, sect. 53).

[1] Pausanias tells us distinctly that this chest was dedicated at Olympia by the Kypselids, descendants of Kypselus; and this seems credible enough. But he also tells us that this was the identical chest in which the infant Kypselus had been concealed, believing this story as told in Herodotus (v. 92). In this latter belief I cannot go along with him, nor do I think that there is any evidence for believing the chest to have been of more ancient date than the persons who dedicated it—in spite of the opinions of O. Müller and Thiersch to the contrary (O. Müller, Archäol. der Kunst, sect. 57; Thiersch, Epochen der Griechischen Kunst, p. 169, 2nd edit.: Pausan. v. 17, 2).

sacred games, that genuine ideas of beauty were first aimed at and in part attained, from whence they passed afterwards to the statues of the gods. Such statues of the athletes seem to commence somewhere between Olympiad 53—58 (568—548 B.C.).

Monumental ornaments in the cities—begin in the sixth century B.C.

It is not until the same interval of time (between 600—550 B.C.) that we find any traces of these architectural monuments by which the more important cities in Greece afterwards attracted to themselves so much renown. The two greatest temples in Greece known to Herodotus were the Artemision at Ephesus, and the Heræon at Samos. Of these the former seems to have been commenced, by the Samian Theodôrus, about 600 B.C.—the latter, begun by the Samian Rhœkus, can hardly be traced to any higher antiquity. The first attempts to decorate Athens by such additions proceeded from Peisistratus and his sons, near the same time. As far as we can judge, too, in the absence of all direct evidence, the temples of Pæstum in Italy and Selinus in Sicily seem to fall in this same century. Of painting during these early centuries, nothing can be affirmed. It never at any time reached the same perfection as sculpture, and we may presume that its years of infancy were at least equally rude.

Importance of Grecian art as a means of Hellenic union.

The immense development of Grecian art subsequently, and the great perfection of Grecian artists, are facts of great importance in the history of the human race; while in regard to the Greeks themselves, these facts not only acted powerfully on the taste of the people, but were also valuable indirectly as the common boast of Hellenism, and as supplying one bond of fraternal sympathy as well as of mutual pride, among its widely-dispersed sections. It is the paucity and weakness of such bonds which renders the history of Greece, prior to 560 B.C., little better than a series of parallel but isolated threads, each attached to a separate city. The increased range of joint Hellenic feeling and action, upon which we shall presently enter, though arising doubtless in great measure from new and common dangers threatening many cities at once, also springs in part from those other causes which have been enumerated in this chapter, as acting on the Grecian mind. It proceeds from the stimulus applied to all the common feelings in religion, art, and recreation

—from the gradual formation of national festivals, appealing in various ways to such tastes and sentiments as animated every Hellenic bosom—from the inspirations of men of genius, poets, musicians, sculptors, architects, who supplied more or less in every Grecian city education for the youth, training for the chorus, and ornament for the locality—from the gradual expansion of science, philosophy, and rhetoric, during the coming period of this history, which rendered one city the intellectual capital of Greece, and brought to Isokratês and Plato pupils from the most distant parts of the Grecian world. It was this fund of common tastes, tendencies, and aptitudes which caused the social atoms of Hellas to gravitate towards each other, and which enabled the Greeks to become something better and greater than an aggregate of petty disunited communities like the Thracians or Phrygians. And the creation of such common, extra-political, Hellenism is the most interesting phænomenon which the historian has to point out in the early period now under our notice. He is called upon to dwell upon it the more forcibly because the modern reader has generally no idea of national union without political union—an association foreign to the Greek mind. Strange as it may seem to find a song-writer put forward as an active instrument of union among his fellow-Hellens, it is not the less true that those poets, whom we have briefly passed in review, by enriching the common language and by circulating from town to town either in person or in their compositions, contributed to fan the flame of Pan-Hellenic patriotism at a time when there were few circumstances to co-operate with them, and when the causes tending to perpetuate isolation seemed in the ascendant.

# CHAPTER XXX.

## GRECIAN AFFAIRS DURING THE GOVERNMENT OF PEISISTRATUS AND HIS SONS AT ATHENS.

WE now arrive at what may be called the second period of Grecian history, beginning with the rule of Peisistratus at Athens and of Crœsus in Lydia.

Peisistratus and his sons at Athens—B.C. 560—510—uncertain chronology as to Peisistratus.

It has been already stated that Peisistratus made himself despot of Athens in 560 B.C. He died in 527 B.C., and was succeeded by his son Hippias, who was deposed and expelled in 510 B.C., thus making an entire space of fifty years between the first exaltation of the father and the final expulsion of the son. These chronological points are settled on good evidence. But the thirty-three years covered by the reign of Peisistratus are interrupted by two periods of exile, one of them lasting not less than ten years, the other five years; and the exact place of the years of exile, being nowhere laid down upon authority, has been differently determined by the conjectures of chronologers.[1] Partly from this half-known chronology, partly from a very scanty collection of facts, the history of the half-century now before us can only be given very imperfectly. Nor can we wonder at our ignorance, when we find that even among the Athenians themselves, only a century afterwards, statements the most incorrect and contradictory respecting the Peisistratids were in circulation, as Thucydidês distinctly, and somewhat reproachfully, acquaints us.

More than thirty years had now elapsed since the promulgation of the Solonian constitution, whereby the annual Senate of

[1] Mr. Fynes Clinton (Fast. Hellen. vol. ii. Appendix, c. 2, p. 201) has stated and discussed the different opinions on the chronology of Peisistratus and his sons.

Four Hundred had been created, and the public assembly (preceded in its action as well as aided and regulated by this senate) invested with a power of exacting responsibility from the magistrates after their year of office. The seeds of the subsequent democracy had thus been sown, and no doubt the administration of the archons had been practically softened by it. Yet nothing in the nature of a democratical sentiment yet had been created. A hundred years hence, we shall find that sentiment unanimous and potent among the enterprising masses of Athens and Peiræus, and shall be called upon to listen to loud complaints of the difficulty of dealing with "that angry, waspish, intractable little old man, Dêmus of Pnyx"—so Aristophanês[1] calls the Athenian people to their faces, with a freedom which shows that he at least counted on their good temper. But between 560—510 B.C. the people are as passive in respect to political rights and securities as the most strenuous enemy of democracy could desire, and the government is transferred from hand to hand by bargains and cross-changes between two or three powerful men,[2] at the head of partisans who echo their voices, espouse their personal quarrels, and draw the sword at their command. It was this ancient constitution—Athens as it stood before the Athenian democracy—which the Macedonian Antipater professed to restore in 322 B.C., when he caused the majority of the poorer citizens to be excluded altogether from the political franchise.[3]

State of feeling in Attica at the accession of Peisistratus.

By the stratagem recounted in a former chapter,[4] Peisistratus had obtained from the public assembly a guard which he had employed to acquire forcible possession of the acropolis. He thus

[1] Ἀγροῖκος ὀργὴν, κναμοτρῳξ, ἀκράχολος
Δῆμος Πυνκίτης, δύσκολον γεροντίον.—
Aristoph. Equit. 41.

I need hardly mention that the Pnyx was the place in which the Athenian public assemblies were held.

[2] Plutarch (De Herodot. Malign. c. 15, p. 858) is angry with Herodotus for imparting so petty and personal a character to the dissensions between the Alkmæônids and Peisistratus: his severe remarks in that treatise, however, tend almost always to strengthen rather than to weaken the credibility of the historian.

[3] Plutarch, Phôkiôn, c. 27. ἀπεκρίνατο φιλίαν ἔσεσθαι τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις καὶ ξυμμαχίαν, ἐκδοῦσι μὲν τοὺς περὶ Δημοσθένη καὶ Ὑπερίδην, πολιτευομένοις δὲ τὴν πάτριον ἀπὸ τιμήματος πολιτείαν, δεξαμένοις δὲ φρουρὰν εἰς τὴν Μουνυχίαν, ἔτι δὲ χρήματα τοῦ πολέμου καὶ ζημίαν προσεκτίσασιν. Compare Diodôr. xviii. 18.

Twelve thousand of the poorer citizens were disfranchised by this change (Plutarch, Phôkiôn, c. 28).

[4] See the preceding volume, ch. xi. pp. 520—521.

became master of the administration; but he employed his power honourably and well, not disturbing the existing forms farther than was necessary to ensure to himself full mastery. Nevertheless we may see by the verses of Solôn[1] (the only contemporary evidence which we possess), that the prevalent sentiment was by no means favourable to his recent proceeding, and that there was in many minds a strong feeling both of terror and aversion, which presently manifested itself in the armed coalition of his two rivals—Megaklês at the head of the Parali or inhabitants of the sea-board, and Lykurgus at the head of those in the neighbouring plain. As the conjunction of the two formed a force too powerful for Peisistratus to withstand, he was driven into exile, after no long possession of his despotism. But the time came (how soon we cannot tell) when the two rivals who had expelled him quarrelled. Megaklês made propositions to Peisistratus, inviting him to resume the sovereignty, promising his own aid, and stipulating that Peisistratus should marry his daughter. The conditions being accepted, a plan was laid between the two new allies for carrying them into effect, by a novel stratagem—since the simulated wounds and pretence of personal danger were not likely to be played off a second time with success. The two conspirators clothed a stately woman, six feet high, named Phyê, in the panoply and costume of Athênê—surrounded her with the processional accompaniments belonging to the goddess—and placed her in a chariot with Peisistratus by her side. In this guise the exiled despot and his adherents approached the city and drove up to the acropolis, preceded by heralds, who cried aloud to the people,—"Athenians, receive ye cordially Peisistratus, whom Athênê has honoured above all other men, and is now bringing back into her own acropolis". The people in the city received the reputed goddess with implicit belief and demonstrations of worship, while among the country cantons the report quickly spread that Athênê had appeared in person to restore Peisistratus, who thus found himself, without even a show of resistance, in possession of the acropolis and of the

Retirement of Peisistratus, and stratagem whereby he is reinstated.

[1] Solôn, Fragm. 10, ed. Bergk.—

Εἰ δὲ πεπόνθατε λυγρὰ δι' ὑμετέρην κακό- τητα, Μήτι θεοῖς τούτων μοῖραν ἐπαμφέρετε, &c.

government His own party, united with that of Megaklês, were powerful enough to maintain him, when he had once acquired possession. And probably all, except the leaders, sincerely believed in the epiphany of the goddess, which came to be divulged as having been a deception only after Peisistratus and Megaklês had quarrelled.[1]

[1] Herodot. i. 60. καὶ ἐν τῷ ἄστεϊ πειθόμενοι τὴν γυναίκα εἶναι αὐὴν τὴν θεὸν, προσεύχοντό τε τὴν ἄνθρωπον καὶ ἐδέκοντο τὸν Πεισίστρατον. A statement (Athenæus, xiii. p. 609) represents Phyê to have become afterwards the wife of Hipparchus.

Of this remarkable story, not the least remarkable part is the criticism with which Herodotus himself accompanies it. He treats it as a proceeding infinitely silly (πρήγμα εὐηθέστατον, ὡς ἐγὼ εὑρίσκω, μακρῷ); he cannot conceive how Greeks, so much superior to barbarians—and even Athenians, the cleverest of all the Greeks—could have fallen into such a trap. To him the story was told as a deception from the beginning, and he did not perhaps take pains to put himself into the state of feeling of those original spectators who saw the chariot approach, without any warning or preconceived suspicion. But even allowing for this, his criticism brings to our view the alteration and enlargement which had taken place in the Greek mind during the century between Peisistratus and Periklês. Doubtless neither the latter nor any of his contemporaries could have succeeded in a similar trick.

The fact, and the criticism upon it, now before us, are remarkably illustrated by an analogous case recounted in a previous chapter (vol. ii. chap. viii.). Nearly at the same period as this stratagem of Peisistratus, the Lacedæmonians and the Argeians agreed to decide, by a combat of three hundred select champions, the dispute between them as to the territory of Kynuria. The combat actually took place, and the heroism of Othryadês, sole Spartan survivor, has been already recounted. In the eleventh year of the Peloponnesian war (shortly after or near upon the period when we may conceive the history of Herodotus to have been finished) the Argeians, concluding a treaty with Lacedæmôn, introduced as a clause into it the liberty of reviving their pretensions to Kynuria, and of again deciding the dispute by a combat of select champions. To the Lacedæmonians of that time this appeared extreme folly—the very proceeding which had been actually resorted to a century before. Here is another case, in which the change in the point of view, and the increased positive tendencies in the Greek mind, are brought to our notice not less forcibly than by the criticism of Herodotus upon Phyê-Athênê.

Istrus (one of the Atthido-graphers of the third century B.C.) and Antiklês published books respecting the personal manifestations or epiphanies of the gods—Ἀπόλλωνος ἐπιφανείαι: see Istri Fragm. 33—37, ed. Didot. If Peisistratus and Megaklês had never quarrelled, their joint stratagem might have continued to pass for a genuine epiphany, and might have been included as such in the work of Istrus. I will add, that the real presence of the gods, at the festivals celebrated in their honour, was an idea continually brought before the minds of the Greeks.

The Athenians fully believed the epiphany of the God Pan to Pheidippidês the courier on his march to Sparta a little before the battle of Marathôn (Herodot. vi. 105. καὶ ταῦτα Ἀθηναῖοι πιστεύσαντες εἶναι ἀληθέα), and even Herodotus himself does not controvert it, though he relaxes the positive character of history so far as to add—"as Pheidippidês himself said and recounted publicly to the Athenians". His informants in this case were doubtless sincere believers; whereas in the case of Phyê, the story was told to him at first as a fabrication.

At Gela in Sicily, seemingly not long before this restoration of Peisistratus, Têlinês (ancestor of the despot Gelôn) had brought back some exiles to Gela, "without any armed force, but merely through the sacred ceremonies and appurtenances of the subterranean goddesses"—ἔχων οὐδεμίην ἀνδρῶν δύναμιν, ἀλλ' ἱρὰ τουτέων τῶν θεῶν — τούτοισι δ' ὧν πίσυνος ἐὼν,

The daughter of Megaklês, according to agreement, quickly became the wife of Peisistratus, but she bore him no children. It became known that her husband, having already adult sons by a former marriage, and considering that the Kylonian curse rested upon all the Alkmæônid family, did not intend that she should become a mother.[1] Megaklês was so incensed at this behaviour, that he not only renounced his alliance with Peisistratus, but even made his peace with the third party, the adherents of Lykurgus, and assumed so menacing an attitude, that the despot was obliged to evacuate Attica. He retired to Eretria in Eubœa, where he remained no less than ten years, employed in making preparations for a forcible return, and exercising, even while in exile, a degree of influence much exceeding that of a private man. He not only lent valuable aid to Lygdamis of Naxos[2] in constituting himself despot of that island, but possessed, we know not how, the means of rendering important service to different cities, Thêbes in particular. They repaid him by large contributions of money to aid in his re-establishment: mercenaries were hired from Argos, and the Naxian Lygdamis came himself both with money and with troops. Thus equipped and aided, Peisistratus landed at Marathôn in Attica. How the Athenian government had been conducted during his ten years' absence, we do not know; but the leaders of it permitted him to remain undisturbed at Marathôn, and to assemble his partisans both from the city and from the country. It was not until he broke up from Marathôn and had reached Pallênê on his way to Athens, that they took the field against him. Moreover, their conduct, even when the two armies were near together, must have been either extremely negligent or corrupt; for Peisistratus found means to attack them unprepared, routing their forces almost without resistance. In fact, the proceedings have altogether the air of a concerted betrayal. For the defeated troops, though unpursued, are said to have dispersed and returned to their

Quarrel of Peisistratus with the Alkmæônids —his second retirement.

His second and final restoration.

κατήγαγε (Herodot. vii. 153). Herodotus does not tell us the details which he had heard of the manner in which this restoration at Gela was brought about; but his general language intimates that they were remarkable details, and they might have illustrated the story of Phyê-Athênê.

[1] Herodot. i. 61. Peisistratus—ἐμίχθη οἱ οὐ κατὰ νόμον.

[2] About Lygdamis, see Athenæus, viii. p. 348, and his citation from the lost work of Aristotle on the Grecian Πολιτεῖαι; also Aristot. Politic. v. 5, 1.

homes forthwith, in obedience to the proclamation of Peisistratus, who marched on to Athens, and found himself a third time ruler.[1]

On this third successful entry, he took vigorous precautions for rendering his seat permanent. The Alkmæônidæ and their immediate partisans retired into exile: but he seized the children of those who remained and whose sentiments he suspected, as hostages for the behaviour of their parents, and placed them in Naxos under the care of Lygdamis. Moreover he provided himself with a powerful body of Thracian mercenaries, paid by taxes levied upon the people:[2] and he was careful to conciliate the favour of the gods by a purification of the sacred island of Dêlos. All the dead bodies which had been buried within sight of the temple of Apollo were exhumed and reinterred farther off. At this time the Delian festival—attended by the Asiatic Ionians and the islanders, and with which Athens was of course peculiarly connected—must have been beginning to decline from its pristine magnificence; for the subjugation of the continental Ionic cities by Cyrus had been already achieved, and the power of Samos, though increased under the despot Polykratês, seems to have increased at the expense and to the ruin of the smaller Ionic islands. Partly from the same feelings which led to the purification of Dêlos—partly as an act of party revenge—Peisistratus caused the houses of the Alkmæônids to be levelled with the ground, and the bodies of the deceased members of that family to be disinterred and cast out of the country.[3]

His strong government—mercenaries—purification of Dêlos.

This third and last period of the rule of Peisistratus lasted several years, until his death in 527 B.C. It is said to have been so mild in its character, that he once even suffered himself to be cited for trial before the senate of Areopagus; yet as we know that he had to maintain a large body of Thracian mercenaries out of the funds of the people, we shall be inclined to construe this eulogium comparatively rather than positively. Thucydidês affirms that both he and his sons governed in a wise and virtuous spirit, levying from the people only an income-tax of five per cent.[4] This is high praise

Mild despotism of Peisistratus.

[1] Herodot. i. 63.

[2] Herodot. i. 64. ἐπικούροισί τε πολλοῖσι, καὶ χρημάτων συνόδοισι, τῶν μὲν αὐτόθεν, τῶν δὲ ἀπὸ Στρύμονος ποταμοῦ προσιόντων.

[3] Isokratês, Or. xiv. De Bigis, c. 351.

[4] For the statement of Boeckh, Dr. Arnold, and Dr. Thirlwall, that Peisi-

coming from such an authority, though it seems that we ought to make some allowance for the circumstance of Thucydidês being connected by descent with the Peisistratid family.[1] The judgment of Herodotus is also very favourable respecting Peisistratus; that of Aristotle favourable, yet qualified, since he includes these despots among the list of those who undertook public and sacred works with the deliberate view of impoverishing as well as of occupying their subjects. This supposition is countenanced by

stratus had levied a tythe or tax of ten per cent., and that his sons reduced it to the half, I find no sufficient warrant: certainly the spurious letter of Peisistratus to Solôn in Diogenes Laërtius (i. 53) ought not to be considered as proving anything. Boeckh, Public Economy of Athens, B. iii. c. 6 (i. 351 German); Dr. Arnold ad Thucyd. vi. 34; Dr. Thirlwall, Hist. of Gr. ch. xi. p. 72—74. Idomeneus (ap. Athenæ. xii. p. 533) considers the sons of Peisistratus to have indulged in pleasures to an extent more costly and oppressive to the people than their father.

Herodotus (i. 64) tells us that Peisistratus brought mercenary soldiers from the Strymôn, but that he levied the money to pay them in Attica—*ἐρρίζωσε τὴν τυραννίδα ἐπικούροισί τε πολλοῖσι, καὶ χρημάτων συνόδοισι, τῶν μὲν αὐτόθεν, τῶν δὲ ἀπὸ Στρύμονος ποταμοῦ συνιόντων.* On this passage, apparently, Dr. Thirlwall has founded a statement (p. 68), for which in my first edition I did not perceive his authority — "He (Peisistratus) possessed lands on the Strymôn in Thrace, which yielded a large revenue". The words of Herodotus undoubtedly justify Dr. Thirlwall's construction; but they are also consistent with a different construction, which appears to me in this case the truer one, referring *τῶν μέν* to *χρημάτων*, and *τῶν δέ* to *ἐπικούροισι*. "Peisistratus collected the mercenary soldiers from the Strymôn, and the money at home." If he wanted mercenaries, the bank of the Strymôn, with the Thracian population adjoining, was the natural place to seek them. But I think it highly improbable that "he possessed lands on the Strymôn which yielded him a large revenue". If this is to be admitted, we must suppose him to have founded, or to have taken a leading part in founding, a city at the mouth of the Strymôn; for large private landed property, possessed by a man in the territory of a foreign city, was at that time a thing rare indeed, if not altogether unknown. But if Peisistratus had established any settlement at the mouth of the Strymôn, we must surely have heard more of it afterwards. It would have been retained by Hippias when expelled from Athens; and Herodotus (v. 65—94) would surely have told us something about it on that occasion. Moreover, the mouth of the Strymôn was a capital position, more coveted than almost any other by enterprising Greeks, and stoutly maintained by the Edonian Thracians. Had there been any settlement established there by Peisistratus, we must have found some mention of it either from Herodotus or Thucydidês, when they advert to the proceedings of Histiæus, Aristagoras, and the Athenians connected with the subsequent settlement of the locality, and ending at last in the foundation of Amphipolis (Herodot. v. 11, 23, 94; Thucyd. iv. 102).

[1] Hermippus (ap. Marcellin. Vit. Thucyd. p. IX.), and the Scholiast on Thucyd. i. 20, affirm that Thucydidês was connected by relationship with the Peisistratidæ. His manner of speaking of them certainly lends countenance to the assertion; not merely as he twice notices their history, once briefly (i. 20) and again at considerable length (vi. 54—59), though it does not lie within the direct compass of his period—but also as he so emphatically announces his own personal knowledge of their family relations—*Ὅτι δὲ πρεσβύτατος ὢν Ἱππίας ἦρξεν, εἰδὼς μὲν καὶ ἀκοῇ ἀκριβέστερον ἄλλων ἰσχυρίζομαι* (vi. 55).

Aristotle (Politic. v. 9, 21) mentions it as a report (*φασι*) that Peisistratus obeyed the summons to appear before the Areopagus; Plutarch adds that the person who had summoned him did not appear to bring the cause to trial (Vit. Solôn. 31), which is not at all surprising; compare Thucyd. vi. 56, 57.

the prodigious scale upon which the temple of Zeus Olympius at Athens was begun by Peisistratus—a scale much exceeding either the Parthenôn or the temple of Athênê Polias; both of which, nevertheless, were erected in later times, when the means of Athens were decidedly larger[1] and her disposition to demonstrative piety certainly no way diminished. It was left by him unfinished, nor was it ever completed until the Roman emperor Hadrian undertook the task. Moreover, Peisistratus introduced the greater Panathenaic festival, solemnized every four years, in the third Olympic year: the annual Panathenaic festival, henceforward called the Lesser, was still continued.

I have already noticed, at considerable length, the care which he bestowed in procuring full and correct copies of the Homeric poems, as well as in improving the recitation of them at the Panathenaic festival,—a proceeding, for which we owe him much gratitude, but which has been shown to be erroneously interpreted by various critics. He probably also collected the works of other poets—called by Aulus Gellius,[2] in language not well suited to the sixth century B.C., a library thrown open to the public. The service which he thus rendered must have been highly valuable at a time when writing and reading were not widely extended. His son Hipparchus followed up the same taste, taking pleasure in the society of the most eminent poets of the day,[3]—Simonidês, Anakreôn, and Lasus; not to mention the Athenian mystic Onomakritus, who, though not pretending to the gift of prophecy himself, passed for the proprietor and editor of the various prophecies ascribed to the ancient name of Musæus. The Peisistratids, well-versed in these prophecies, set great value upon them, and guarded their integrity so carefully, that Onomakritus, being detected on one occasion in the act of interpolating them, was banished by Hipparchus in consequence.[4] The statues of Hermês, erected by this prince or by his personal friends in various parts of Attica,[5] and inscribed with short moral sentences, are extolled by the author of the Platonic dialogue

[1] Aristot. Politic. v. 9, 4; Dikæarchus, Vita Græciæ, pp. 140—166, ed. Fuhr; Pausan. i. 18, 8.

[2] Aul. Gell. N. A. vi. 17.

[3] Herodot. vii. 6; Pseudo-Plato, Hipparchus, p. 229.

[4] Herodot. v. 93; vii. 6. Ὀνομάκριτον, χρησμολόγον καὶ διαθέτην τῶν χρησμῶν τῶν Μουσαίου. See Pausan. i. 22, 7. Compare, about the literary tendencies of the Peisistratids, Nitzsch, De Historiâ Homeri, ch. 30, p. 168.

[5] Philochor. Frag. 69, ed. Didot; Plato, Hipparch. p. 230.

called Hipparchus, with an exaggeration which approaches to irony. It is certain, however, that both the sons of Peisistratus, as well as himself, were exact in fulfilling the religious obligations of the state, and ornamented the city in several ways, especially the public fountain Kallirrhoê. They are said to have maintained the pre-existing forms of law and justice, merely taking care always to keep themselves and their adherents in the effective offices of state, and in the full reality of power. They were moreover modest and popular in their personal demeanour, and charitable to the poor; yet one striking example occurs of unscrupulous enmity, in their murder of Kimôn by night through the agency of hired assassins.[1] There is good reason, however, for believing that the government both of Peisistratus and of his sons was in practice generally mild until after the death of Hipparchus by the hands of Harmodius and Aristogeitôn, after which event the surviving Hippias became alarmed, cruel, and oppressive during his last four years. Hence the harshness of this concluding period left upon the Athenian mind[2] that profound and imperishable hatred, against the dynasty generally, which Thucydidês reluctantly admits: labouring to show that it was not deserved by Peisistratus, nor at first by Hippias.

His sons Hippias and Hipparchus.

Peisistratus left three legitimate sons—Hippias, Hipparchus, and Thessalus. The general belief at Athens among the contemporaries of Thucydidês was that Hipparchus was the eldest of the three and had succeeded him. Yet the historian emphatically pronounces this to be a mistake, and certifies upon his own responsibility that Hippias was both eldest son and successor. Such an assurance from him, fortified by certain reasons in themselves not very conclusive, is sufficient ground for our belief—the more so as Herodotus countenances the same version; but we are surprised at such a degree of historical carelessness in the Athenian public, and seemingly even in Plato,[3]

[1] Herodot. vi. 38—103; Theopomp. ap. Athenæ. xii. p. 533.

[2] Thucyd. vi. 53; Pseudo-Plato, Hipparch. p. 230; Pausan. i. 23, 1.

[3] Thucyd. i. 20, about the general belief of the Athenian public in his time—*Ἀθηναίων γοῦν τὸ πλῆθος οἴονται ὑφ' Ἁρμοδίου καὶ Ἀριστογείτονος Ἵππαρχον τύραννον ὄντα ἀποθανεῖν, καὶ οὐκ ἴσασιν ὅτι Ἱππίας πρεσβύτατος ὢν ἦρχε τῶν Πεισιστράτου παιδῶν*, &c.

The Pseudo-Plato in the dialogue called Hipparchus adopts this belief, and the real Plato in his Symposion (c. 9, p. 182) seems to countenance it.

about a matter both interesting and comparatively recent. In order to abate this surprise, and to explain how the name of Hipparchus came to supplant that of Hippias in the popular talk, Thucydidês recounts the memorable story of Harmodius and Aristogeitôn.

Harmodius and Aristogeitôn.

Of these two Athenian citizens,[1] both belonging to the ancient gens called Gephyræi, the former was a beautiful youth, attached to the latter by a mutual friendship and devoted intimacy which Grecian manners did not condemn. Hipparchus made repeated propositions to Harmodius, which were repelled, but which, on becoming known to Aristogeitôn, excited both his jealousy and his fears lest the disappointed suitor should employ force—fears justified by the proceedings not unusual with Grecian despots,[2] and by the absence of all legal protection against outrage from such a quarter. Under these feelings, he began to look about, in the best way that he could, for some means of putting down the despotism. Meanwhile Hipparchus, though not entertaining any designs of violence, was so incensed at the refusal of Harmodius, that he could not be satisfied without doing something to insult or humiliate him. In order to conceal the motive from which the insult really proceeded, he offered it, not directly to Harmodius, but to his sister. He caused this young maiden to be one day summoned to take her station in a religious procession as one of the Kanêphorœ or basket-carriers, according to the practice usual at Athens. But when she arrived at the place where her fellow-maidens were assembled, she was dismissed with scorn as unworthy of so respectable a function, and the summons addressed to her was disavowed.[3]

[1] Herodot. v. 55—58. Harmodius is affirmed by Plutarch to have been of the deme Aphidnæ (Plutarch, Symposiacon, i. 10, p. 628).

It is to be recollected that he died before the introduction of the Ten Tribes, and before the recognition of the demes as political elements in the commonwealth.

[2] For the terrible effects produced by this fear of ὕβρις εἰς τὴν ἡλικίαν, see Plutarch, Kimôn, 1; Aristot. Polit. v. 9, 17.

[3] Thucyd. vi. 56. Τὸν δ' οὖν Ἁρμόδιον ἀπαρνηθέντα τὴν πείρασιν, ὥσπερ διενοεῖτο, προυπηλάκισεν· ἀδελφὴν γὰρ αὐτοῦ, κόρην, ἐπαγγείλαντες ἥκειν κανοῦν οἴσουσαν ἐν πομπῇ τινι, ἀπήλασαν, λέγοντες οὐδὲ ἐπαγγεῖλαι ἀρχὴν, διὰ τὸ μὴ ἀξίαν εἶναι.

Dr. Arnold, in his note, supposes that this exclusion of the sister of Harmodius by the Peisistratids may have been founded on the circumstance that she belonged to the gens Gephyræi (Herodot. v. 57); her foreign blood, and her being in certain respects ἄτιμος, disqualified her (he thinks) from ministering to the worship of the gods of Athens.

An insult thus publicly offered filled Harmodius with indignation, and still farther exasperated the feelings of Aristogeitôn. Both of them, resolving at all hazards to put an end to the despotism, concerted means for aggression with a few select associates. They awaited the festival of the Great Panathenæa, wherein the body of the citizens were accustomed to march up in armed procession, with spear and shield, to the acropolis; this being the only day on which an armed body could come together without suspicion. The conspirators appeared armed like the rest of the citizens, but carrying concealed daggers besides.

They conspire and kill Hipparchus, B.C. 514.

Harmodius and Aristogeitôn undertook with their own hands to kill the two Peisistratids, while the rest promised to stand forward immediately for their protection against the foreign mercenaries; and though the whole number of persons engaged was small, they counted upon the spontaneous sympathies of the armed bystanders in an effort to regain their liberties, so soon as the blow should once be struck. The day of the festival having arrived, Hippias, with his foreign body-guard around him, was marshalling the armed citizens for procession, in the Kerameikus without the gates, when Harmodius and Aristogeitôn approached with concealed daggers to execute their purpose. On coming near, they were thunderstruck to behold one of their fellow-conspirators talking familiarly with Hippias, who was of easy access to every man. They immediately concluded that the plot was betrayed. Expecting to be seized, and wrought up to a state of desperation, they resolved at least not to die without having revenged themselves on Hipparchus; whom they found within the city gates near the chapel called the Leôkorion, and immediately slew him. His attendant guards killed Harmodius on the spot; while Aristogeitôn, rescued for the moment by the surrounding crowd,

There is no positive reason to support the conjecture of Dr. Arnold, which seems moreover virtually discountenanced by the narrative of Thucydidês, who plainly describes the treatment of this young woman as a deliberate, preconcerted insult. Had there existed any assignable ground of exclusion, such as that which Dr. Arnold supposes, leading to the inference that the Peisistratids could not admit her without violating religious custom, Thucydidês would hardly have neglected to allude to it, for it would have lightened the insult; and indeed on that supposition, the sending of the original summons might have been made to appear as an accidental mistake. I will add, that Thucydidês, though no way forfeiting his obligations to historical truth, is evidently not disposed to omit anything which can be truly said in favour of the Peisistratids.

was afterwards taken, and perished in the tortures applied to make him disclose his accomplices.[1]

The news flew quickly to Hippias in the Kerameikus, who heard it earlier than the armed citizens near him awaiting his order for the commencement of the procession. With extraordinary self-command, he took advantage of this precious instant of foreknowledge, and advanced towards them,—directing them to drop their arms for a short time, and assemble on an adjoining ground. They unsuspectingly obeyed; upon which he ordered his guards to take possession of the vacant arms. Being now undisputed master, he seized the persons of all those citizens whom he mistrusted—especially all those who had daggers about them, which it was not the practice to carry in the Panathenaic procession.

Such is the memorable narrative of Harmodius and Aristogeitôn, peculiarly valuable inasmuch as it all comes from Thucydidês.[2] To possess great power—to be above legal restraint—to inspire extraordinary fear—is a privilege so much coveted by the giants among mankind, that we may well take notice of those cases in which it brings even misfortune upon themselves. The fear inspired by Hipparchus—of designs which he did not really entertain, but was likely to entertain, and competent to execute without hindrance—was here the grand cause of his destruction.

The conspiracy here detailed happened in 514 B.C., during the thirteenth year of the reign of Hippias, which lasted four years longer, until 510 B.C. These last four years, in the belief of the Athenian public, counted for his whole reign; nay, many persons made the still greater historical mistake of eliding these last four years altogether, and of supposing that the conspiracy of Harmodius and Aristogeitôn had deposed the Peisistratid government and liberated Athens. Both poets and philosophers shared this faith, which is distinctly put forth in the beautiful and popular Skolion or song on the

Strong and lasting sentiment, coupled with great historical mistake, in the Athenian public.

[1] Thucyd. vi. 58. οὐ ῥᾳδίως διετέθη: compare Polyæn. i. 22; Diodôrus, Fragm. lib. x. p. 62, vol. iv. ed. Wess.; Justin, ii. 9. See also a good note of Dr. Thirlwall on the passage, Hist. of Gr. vol. ii. ch. xi. p. 77, 2nd ed. I agree with him, that we may fairly construe the indistinct phrase of Thucydidês by the more precise statement of later authors, who mention the torture.

[2] Thucyd. i. 20; vi. 54—59; Herodot. v. 55, 56; vi. 123; Aristot. Polit. v. 8, 9.

subject: the two friends are there celebrated as the authors of liberty at Athens—"they slew the despot and gave to Athens equal laws".[1] So inestimable a present was alone sufficient to enshrine in the minds of the subsequent democracy those who had sold their lives to purchase it. Moreover we must recollect that the intimate connexion between the two, though repugnant to the modern reader, was regarded at Athens with sympathy,—so that the story took hold of the Athenian mind by the vein of romance conjointly with that of patriotism. Harmodius and Aristogeitôn were afterwards commemorated both as the winners and as the protomartyrs of Athenian liberty. Statues were erected in their honour shortly after the final expulsion of the Peisistratids; immunity from taxes and public burdens was granted to the descendants of their families; and the speaker who proposed the abolition of such immunities, at a time when the number had been abusively multiplied, made his only special exception in favour of this respected lineage.[2] And since the name of Hipparchus was universally notorious as the person slain, we discover how it was that he came to be considered by an uncritical public as the predominant member of the Peisistratid family—the eldest son and successor of Peisistratus—the reigning despot—to the comparative neglect of Hippias. The same public probably cherished many other anecdotes,[3] not the less eagerly believed because they could not be authenticated, respecting this eventful period.

Whatever may have been the previous moderation of Hippias, indignation at the death of his brother and fear for his own safety[4] now induced him to drop it altogether. It is attested both by

[1] See the words of the Song—

*Ὅτι τὸν τύραννον κτανέτην*
*Ἰσονόμους τ' Ἀθήνας ἐποιησάτην*—

ap. Athenæum, xv. p. 691.

The epigram of the Keian Simonidês (Fragm. 132, ed. Bergk—ap. Hephæstion. c. 14, p. 26, ed. Gaisf.) implies a similar belief: also the passages in Plato, Symposion, p. 182, in Aristot. Polit. v. 8, 21, and Arrian, Exped. Alex. iv. 10, 3.

[2] Herodot. iv. 109; Demosthen. adv. Leptin. c. 27, p. 495; cont. Meidiam, c. 47, p. 569; and the oath prescribed in the Psephism of Demophantus—Andokidês, De Mysteriis, p. 13; Pliny, H. N. xxxiv. 4—8; Pausan. i. 8, 5; Plutarch, Aristeidês, 27.

The statues were carried away from Athens by Xerxês, and restored to the Athenians by Alexander after his conquest of Persia (Arrian, Ex. Al. iii. 16, 14; Pliny, H. N. xxxiv. 4—8).

[3] One of these stories may be seen in Justin, ii. 9—who gives the name of Dioklês to Hipparchus—"Diocles, alter ex filiis, per vim stuprata virgine, a fratre puellæ interficitur".

[4] *Ἡ γὰρ δειλία φονικώτατόν ἐστιν ἐν ταῖς τυραννίσιν*—observes Plutarch (Artaxerxês, c. 25).

Thucydidês and Herodotus, and admits of no doubt, that his power was now employed harshly and cruelly—that he put to death a considerable number of citizens. We find also a statement noway improbable in itself and affirmed both in Pausanias and Plutarch—inferior authorities, yet still in this case sufficiently credible—that he caused Leæna, the mistress of Aristogeitôn, to be tortured to death, in order to extort from her a knowledge of the secrets and accomplices of the latter.[1] But as he could not but be sensible that this system of terrorism was full of peril to himself, so he looked out for shelter and support in case of being expelled from Athens. With this view he sought to connect himself with Darius king of Persia—a connexion full of consequences to be hereafter developed. Æantidês, son of Hippoklus the despot of Lampsakus on the Hellespont, stood high at this time in the favour of the Persian monarch, which induced Hippias to give him his daughter Archedikê in marriage; no small honour to the Lampsakene, in the estimation of Thucydidês.[2] To explain how Hippias came to fix upon this town, however, it is necessary to say a few words on the foreign policy of the Peisistratids.

*Hippias despot alone—514—510 B.C.—his cruelty and conscious insecurity.*

It has already been mentioned that the Athenians even so far back as the days of the poet Alkæus, had occupied Sigeium in the Troad, and had there carried on war with the Mityleneans; so that their acquisitions in these regions date much before the time of Peisistratus. Owing probably to this circumstance, an application was made to them in the early part of his reign from the Dolonkian Thracians inhabitants of the Chersonese on the opposite side of the Hellespont, for aid against their powerful neighbours the Absinthian tribe of Thracians. Opportunity was thus offered for sending out a colony to acquire this valuable peninsula for Athens. Peisistratus willingly

*Connexion of Athens with the Thracian Chersonêsus and the Asiatic coast of the Hellespont.*

[1] Pausan. i. 23, 2; Plutarch, De Garrulitate. p. 897; Polyæn. viii. 45; Athenæus, xiii. p. 596.

[2] We can hardly be mistaken in putting this interpretation on the words of Thucydidês—'Αθηναῖος ὢν, Λαμψακηνῷ ἔδωκε (vi. 59).

Some financial tricks and frauds are ascribed to Hippias by the author of the Pseudo-Aristotelian second book of the Œconomica (ii. 4). I place little reliance on the statements in this treatise respecting persons of early date, such as Kypselus or Hippias: in respect to facts of the subsequent period of Greece, between 450—300 B.C., the author's means of information will doubtless render him a better witness.

entered into the scheme, while Miltiadês son of Kypselus, a noble Athenian living impatiently under his despotism, was no less pleased to take the lead in executing it: his departure and that of other malcontents as founders of a colony suited the purpose of all parties. According to the narrative of Herodotus—alike pious and picturesque, and doubtless circulating as authentic at the annual games which the Chersonesites, even in his time, celebrated to the honour of their œkist—it is the Delphian god who directs the scheme and singles out the individual. The chiefs of the distressed Dolonkians, going to Delphi to crave assistance towards procuring Grecian colonists, were directed to choose for their œkist the individual who should first show them hospitality on their quitting the temple. They departed and marched all along what was called the Sacred Road, through Phôkis and Bœotia to Athens, without receiving a single hospitable invitation. At length they entered Athens, and passed by the house of Miltiadês while he himself was sitting in front of it. Seeing men whose costume and arms marked them out as strangers, he invited them into his house and treated them kindly: upon which they apprised him that he was the man fixed upon by the oracle and adjured him not to refuse his concurrence. After asking for himself personally the opinion of the oracle, and receiving an affirmative answer, he consented; sailing as œkist at the head of a body of Athenian emigrants to the Chersonese.[1]

First Miltiades—œkist of the Chersonese.

Having reached this peninsula, and having been constituted despot of the mixed Thracian and Athenian population, he lost no time in fortifying the narrow isthmus by a wall reaching all across from Kardia to Paktya, a distance of about four miles and a half; so that the Absinthian invaders were for the time effectually shut out,[2] though the

[1] Herodot. vi. 36, 37.

[2] Thus the Scythians broke into the Chersonese even during the government of Miltiadês son of Kimôn, nephew of Miltiadês the œkist, about forty years after the wall had been erected (Herodot. vi. 40). Again Periklês re-established the cross-wall, on sending to the Chersonese a fresh band of 1000 Athenian settlers (Plutarch, Periklês, c. 19): lastly, Derkyllidas the Lacedæmonian built it anew, in consequence of loud complaints raised by the inhabitants of their defenceless condition—about 397 B.C. (Xenophôn, Hellen. iii. 2, 8—10). So imperfect however did the protection prove, that about half a century afterwards, during the first years of the conquest of Philip of Macedon, an idea was entertained of digging through the isthmus, and converting the peninsula into an island (Demosthenês, Philippic ii. 6, p. 92, and De Haloneso, c. 10, p. 86): an idea however never carried into effect.

protection was not permanently kept up. He also entered into a war with Lampsakus on the Asiatic side of the strait, but was unfortunate enough to fall into an ambuscade and become a prisoner. Nothing preserved his life except the immediate interference of Crœsus king of Lydia, coupled with strenuous menaces addressed to the Lampsakenes, who found themselves compelled to release their prisoner. Miltiadês had acquired much favour with Crœsus, in what manner we are not told. He died childless some time afterwards, while his nephew Stesagoras, who succeeded him, perished by assassination some time subsequent to the death of Peisistratus at Athens.[1]

The expedition of Miltiadês to the Chersonese must have occurred early after the first usurpation of Peisistratus, since even his imprisonment by the Lampsakenes happened before the ruin of Crœsus (546 B.C.). But it was not till much later—probably during the third and most powerful period of Peisistratus—that the latter undertook his expedition against Sigeium in the Troad. This place appears to have fallen into the hands of the Mityleneans: Peisistratus retook it,[2] and placed there his illegitimate son Hegesistratus as despot. The Mityleneans may have been enfeebled at this time (somewhere between 537—527 B.C.) not only by the strides of Persian conquest on the mainland, but also by the ruinous defeat which they suffered from Polykratês and the Samians.[3] Hegesistratus maintained the place against various hostile attempts, throughout all the reign of Hippias, so that the Athenian possessions in those regions comprehended at this period both the Chersonese and Sigeium.[4] To the former of the two, Hippias sent out Miltiadês, nephew of the first œkist, as governor after the death of his brother Stesagoras. The new governor found much discontent in the peninsula, but succeeded in subduing it by entrapping and imprisoning the principal men in each town. He farther took into his pay a regiment of five hundred mercenaries, and married Hegesipylê daughter of the Thracian king Olorus.[5] It must have been about

Second Miltiadês sent out thither by the Peisistratids.

[1] Herodot. vi. 38, 39.

[2] Herodot. v. 94. I have already said that I conceive this as a different war from that in which the poet Alkæus was engaged.

[3] Herodot. iii. 39.

[4] Herodot. vi. 104, 139, 140.

[5] Herodot. vi. 39—103. Cornelius Nepos in his life of Miltiadês confounds in one biography the adventures of two

518 B.C. that this second Miltiadês went out to the Chersonese.[1] He seems to have been obliged to quit it for a time, after the Scythian expedition of Darius, in consequence of having incurred the hostility of the Persians; but he was there from the beginning of the Ionic revolt until about 493 B.C., or two or three years before the battle of Marathôn, on which occasion we shall find him acting commander of the Athenian army.

Both the Chersonese and Sigeium, however, though Athenian possessions, were now tributary and dependent on Persia. It was to Persia that Hippias, during his last years of alarm, looked for support in the event of being expelled from Athens: he calculated upon Sigeium as a shelter, and upon Æantidês as well as Darius as an ally. Neither the one nor the other failed him.

Proceedings of the exiled Alkmæônidæ against Hippias.

The same circumstances which alarmed Hippias and rendered his dominion in Attica at once more oppressive and more odious, tended of course to raise the hopes of his enemies, the Athenian exiles, with the powerful Alkmæônids at their head. Believing the favourable moment to be come, they even ventured upon an invasion of Attica, and occupied a post called Leipsydrion in the mountain range of Parnês, which separates Attica from Bœotia.[2] But their schemes altogether failed: Hippias defeated and drove them out of the country. His dominion now seemed confirmed, for the Lacedæmonians were on terms of intimate friendship with him; and Amyntas king of Macedon, as well as the Thessalians, were his allies. Yet the exiles whom he had beaten in the open field succeeded in an unexpected manœuvre, which, favoured by circumstances, proved his ruin.

By an accident which had occurred in the year 548 B.C.,[3] the

persons—Miltiadês son of Kypselus, the œkist—and Miltiadês son of Kimôn, the victor of Marathôn—the uncle and the nephew.

[1] There is nothing that I know to mark the date except that it was earlier than the death of Hipparchus in 514 B.C., and also earlier than the expedition of Darius against the Scythians, about 516 B.C., in which expedition Miltiadês was engaged: see Mr. Clinton's Fasti Hellenici, and J. M. Schultz, Beitrag zu genaueren Zeitbestimmungen der Hellen. Geschichten von der 63sten bis zur 72sten Olympiade, p. 165, in the Kieler Philologische Studien, 1841.

[2] Herodot. v. 62. The unfortunate struggle at Leipsydrion became afterwards the theme of a popular song (Athenæus, xv. p. 695): see Hesychius, v. Λειψύδριον, and Aristotle, Fragm. Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία, 37, ed. Neumann.

If it be true that Alkibiadês, grandfather of the celebrated Alkibiadês, took part with Kleisthenês and the Alkmæônid exiles in this struggle (see Isokratês, De Bigis, Or. xvi. p. 351) he must have been a mere youth.

[3] Pausan. x. 5, 5.

Delphian temple was set on fire and burnt. To repair this grave loss was an object of solicitude to all Greece; but the outlay required was exceedingly heavy, and it appears to have been long before the money could be collected. The Amphiktyons decreed that one-fourth of the cost should be borne by the Delphians themselves, who found themselves so heavily taxed by such assessment, that they sent envoys throughout all Greece to collect subscriptions in aid, and received, among other donations, from the Greek settlers in Egypt twenty minæ, besides a large present of alum from the Egyptian king Amasis: their munificent benefactor Crœsus fell a victim to the Persians in 546 B.C., so that his treasure was no longer open to them. The total sum required was three hundred talents (equal probably to about £115,000 sterling)[1]—a prodigious amount to be collected from the dispersed Grecian cities, who acknowledged no common sovereign authority, and among whom the proportion reasonable to ask from each was difficult to determine with satisfaction to all parties. At length however the money was collected, and the Amphiktyons were in a situation to make a contract for the building of the temple. The Alkmæônids, who had been in exile ever since the third and final acquisition of power by Peisistratus, took the contract. In executing it, they not only performed the work in the best manner, but even went much beyond the terms stipulated; employing Parian marble for the frontage where the material prescribed to them was coarse stone.[2] As was before remarked in the case of Peisistratus when he was in banishment, we are surprised to find exiles (whose property had been confiscated) so amply furnished with money, unless we

Conflagration and rebuilding of the Delphian temple.

The Alkmæônidæ rebuild the temple with magnificence.

[1] Herodot. i. 50, ii. 180. I have taken the 300 talents of Herodotus as being Æginæan talents, which are to Attic talents in the ratio of 5 : 3. The Inscriptions prove that the accounts of the temple were kept by the Amphiktyons on the Æginæan scale of money: see Corpus Inscrip. (Boeckh), No. 1688, and Boeckh, Metrologie, vii. 4.

[2] Herodot. v. 62. The words of the historian would seem to imply that they only began to think of this scheme of building the temple after the defeat of Leipsydrion, and a year or two before the expulsion of Hippias; a supposition quite inadmissible, since the temple must have taken some years in building.

The loose and prejudiced statement in Philochorus, affirming that the Peisistratids caused the Delphian temple to be burnt, and also that they were at last deposed by the victorious arm of the Alkmæônids (Philochori Fragment. 70, ed. Didot) makes us feel the value of Herodotus and Thucydidês as authorities.

are to suppose that Kleisthenês[1] inherited through his mother wealth independent of Attica, and deposited it in the temple of the Samian Hêrê. But the fact is unquestionable, and they gained signal reputation throughout the Hellenic world for their liberal performance of so important an enterprise. That the erection took considerable time, we cannot doubt. It seems to have been finished, as far as we can conjecture, about a year or two after the death of Hipparchus—512 B.C.—more than thirty years after the conflagration.

To the Delphians, especially, the rebuilding of their temple on so superior a scale was the most essential of all services, and their gratitude towards the Alkmæônids was proportionally great. Partly through such a feeling, partly through pecuniary presents, Kleisthenês was thus enabled to work the oracle for political purposes, and to call forth the powerful arm of Sparta against Hippias. Whenever any Spartan presented himself to consult the oracle, either on private or public business, the answer of the priestess was always in one strain—"Athens must be liberated". The constant repetition of that mandate at length extorted from the piety of the Lacedæmonians a reluctant compliance. Reverence for the god overcame their strong feeling of friendship towards the Peisistratids, and Anchimolius son of Aster was despatched by sea to Athens at the head of a Spartan force to expel them. On landing at Phalêrum, however, he found them already forewarned and prepared, as well as farther strengthened by one thousand horse specially demanded from their allies in Thessaly. Upon the plain of Phalêrum this latter force was found peculiarly effective; so that the division of Anchimolius were driven back to their ships with great loss, and he himself slain.[2] The defeated armament had probably been small, and its repulse only provoked the Lacedæmonians to send a larger, under the command of their king Kleomenês in

Gratitude of the Delphians towards them—they procure from the oracle directions to Sparta, enjoining the expulsion of Hippias.

Spartan expeditions into Attica.

[1] Herodot. vi. 128; Cicero, De Legg. ii. 16. The deposit here mentioned by Cicero, which may very probably have been recorded in an inscription in the temple, must have been made before the time of the Persian conquest of Samos—indeed before the death of Polykratês in 522 B.C., after which period the island fell at once into a precarious situation, and very soon afterwards into the greatest calamities.

[2] Herodot. v. 62, 63.

person, who on this occasion marched into Attica by land. On reaching the plain of Athens, he was assailed by the Thessalian horse, but repelled them in so gallant a style that they at once rode off and returned to their native country; abandoning their allies with a faithlessness not unfrequent in the Thessalian character. Kleomenês marched on without farther resistance to Athens, where he found himself, together with the Alkmæônids and the malcontent Athenians generally, in possession of the town. At that time there was no fortification except round the acropolis, into which Hippias retired, with his mercenaries and the citizens most faithful to him; having taken care to provision it well beforehand, so that it was not less secure against famine than against assault. He might have defied the besieging force, which was noway prepared for a long blockade. Yet, not altogether confiding in his position, he tried to send his children by stealth out of the country; in which proceeding the children were taken prisoners. To procure their restoration, Hippias consented to all that was demanded of him, and withdrew from Attica to Sigeium in the Troad within the space of five days.

Thus fell the Peisistratid dynasty in 510 B.C., fifty years after the first usurpation of its founder.[1] It was put down through the aid of foreigners,[2] and those foreigners, too, wishing well to it in their hearts, though hostile from a mistaken feeling of divine injunction. Yet both the circumstances of its fall, and the course of events which followed, conspire to show that it possessed few attached friends in the country, and that the expulsion of Hippias was welcomed unanimously by the vast majority of Athenians. His family and chief partisans would accompany him into exile—probably as a matter of course, without requiring any formal sentence of condemnation. An altar was erected in the acropolis, with a column hard by, commemorating both the past iniquity of the dethroned dynasty and the names of all its members.[3]

Expulsion of Hippias, and liberation of Athens.

1 Herodot. v. 64, 65.

2 Thucyd. vi. 56, 57.

3 Thucyd. vi. 55. *ὡς ὅ τε βωμὸς σημαίνει, καὶ ἡ στήλη περὶ τῆς τῶν τυράννων ἀδικιας, ἡ ἐν τῇ Ἀθηνῃ ἰων ἀκροπόλει σταθεῖσα.*

Dr. Thirlwall, after mentioning the departure of Hippias, proceeds as follows: "After his departure many severe measures were taken against his adherents, who appear to have been for a long time afterwards a formidable party. They were punished or repressed, some by death, others by exile or by the loss of their political privileges. The family of the tyrants

was condemned to perpetual banishment, and appears to have been excepted from the most comprehensive decrees of amnesty passed in later times." (Hist. of Gr., ch. xi. vol. ii. p. 81.)

I cannot but think that Dr. Thirlwall has here been misled by insufficient authority. He refers to the oration of Andokidês de Mysteriis, sects. 106 and 78 (sect. 106 coincides in part with ch. 18 in the ed. of Dobree). An attentive reading of it will show that it is utterly unworthy of credit in regard to matters anterior to the speaker by one generation or more. The orators often permit themselves great licence in speaking of past facts, but Andokidês in this chapter passes the bounds even of rhetorical licence. First, he states something not bearing the least analogy to the narrative of Herodotus as to the circumstances preceding the expulsion of the Peisistratids, and indeed tacitly setting aside that narrative; next, he actually jumbles together the two capital and distinct exploits of Athens —the battle of Marathôn and the repulse of Xerxês ten years after it. I state this latter charge in the words of Sluiter and Valckenaer, before I consider the former charge: "Verissime ad hæc verba notat Valckenaerius— Confundere videtur Andocidês diversissima; Persica sub Miltiade et Dario et victoriam Marathoniam (v. 14)— quæque evenere sub Themistocle, Xerxis gesta. Hic urbem incendio delevit, non ille. (v. 20.) Nihil magis manifestum est, quam diversa ab oratore confundi." (Sluiter Lection. Andocideæ, p. 147.)

The criticism of these commentators is perfectly borne out by the words of the orator, which are too long to find a place here. But immediately prior to those words he expresses himself as follows, and this is the passage which serves as Dr. Thirlwall's authority: Οἱ γὰρ πατέρες οἱ ὑμέτεροι, γενομένων τῇ πόλει κακῶν μεγάλων, ὅτε οἱ τύραννοι εἶχον τὴν πόλιν, ὁ δὲ δῆμος ἔφυγε, νικήσαντες μαχόμενοι τοὺς τυράννους ἐπὶ Παλληνίῳ, στρατηγοῦντος Δεωγόρου τοῦ προπάππου τοῦ ἐμοῦ, καὶ Χαρίου οὗ ἐκεῖνος τὴν θυγατέρα εἶχεν ἐξ ἧς ὁ ἡμέτερος ἦν πάππος, κατελθόντες εἰς τὴν πατρίδα τοὺς μὲν ἀπέκτειναν, τῶν δὲ φυγὴν κατέγνωσαν, τοὺς δὲ μένειν ἐν τῇ πόλει ἐάσαντες ἠτίμωσαν.

Both Sluiter (Lect. And. p. 8) and Dr. Thirlwall (Hist. p. 80) refer this alleged victory of Leogoras and the Athenian demus to the action described by Herodotus (v. 64) as having been fought by Kleomenês of Sparta against the Thessalian cavalry. But the two events have not a single circumstance in common, except that each is a victory over the Peisistratidæ or their allies; nor could they well be the same event described in different terms, seeing that Kleomenês, marching from Sparta to Athens, could not have fought the Thessalians at Pallênê, which lay on the road from *Marathôn* to Athens. Pallênê was the place where Peisistratus, advancing from Marathôn to Athens on occasion of his second restoration, gained his complete victory over the opposing party, and marched on afterwards to Athens without farther resistance (Herodot. i. 63).

If then we compare the statement given by Andokidês of the preceding circumstances whereby the dynasty of the Peisistratids was put down, with that given by Herodotus, we shall see that the two are radically different: we cannot blend them together, but must make our election between them. Not less different are the representations of the two as to the circumstances which immediately ensued on the fall of Hippias: they would scarcely appear to relate to the same event. That "the adherents of the Peisistratidæ were punished or repressed, some by death, others by exile or by the loss of their political privileges," which is the assertion of Andokidês and Dr. Thirlwall, is not only not stated by Herodotus, but is highly improbable if we accept the facts which he does state; for he tells us that Hippias capitulated and agreed to retire while possessing ample means of resistance— simply from regard to the safety of his children. It is not to be supposed that he would leave his intimate partisans exposed to danger; such of them as felt themselves obnoxious would naturally retire along with him; and if this be what is meant by "many persons condemned to exile," there is no reason to call it in question. But there is little probability that any one was put to death, and still less probability that any were punished by the loss of their political privileges. Within a year afterwards came the comprehensive constitution of Kleisthenês, to be described in the following chapter. Now I consider it eminently unlikely that there were a considerable class of residents in Attica left out of this constitution, under the category of partisans of Peisistratus; indeed

the fact cannot be so, if it be true that the very first person banished under the Kleisthenean ostracism was a person named Hipparchus, a kinsman of Peisistratus (Androtiôn, Fr. 5, ed. Didot; Harpokratiôn, v. Ἵππαρχος); and this latter circumstance depends upon evidence better than that of Andokidês. That there were a party in Attica attached to the Peisistratids I do not doubt. But that they were "a powerful party" (as Dr. Thirlwall imagines), I see nothing to show; and the extraordinary vigour and unanimity of the Athenian people under the Kleisthenean constitution will go far to prove that such could not have been the case.

I will add another reason to evince how completely Andokidês misconceives the history of Athens between 510—480 B.C. He says that when the Peisistratids were put down, many of their partisans were banished, many others allowed to stay at home with the loss of their political privileges; but that afterwards when the overwhelming dangers of the Persian invasion supervened, the people passed a vote to restore the exiles and to remove the existing disfranchisements at home. He would thus have us believe that the exiled partisans of the Peisistratids were all restored, and the disfranchised partisans of the Peisistratids all enfranchised, just at the moment of the Persian invasion, and with the view of enabling Athens better to repel that grave danger. This is nothing less than a glaring mistake; for the first Persian invasion was undertaken with the express view of restoring Hippias, and with the presence of Hippias himself at Marathôn; while the second Persian invasion was also brought on in part by the instigation of his family. Persons who had remained in exile or in a state of disfranchisement down to that time, in consequence of their attachment to the Peisistratids, could not in common prudence be called into action at the moment of peril to help in repelling Hippias himself. It is very true that the exiles and the disfranchised were re-admitted, shortly before the invasion of Xerxês, and under the then pressing calamities of the state. But these persons were not philo-Peisistratids; they were a number gradually accumulated from the sentences of exile and (atimy or) disfranchisement every year passed at Athens. These were punishments applied by the Athenian law to various crimes and public omissions—the persons so sentenced were not politically disaffected, and their aid would then be of use in defending the state against a foreign enemy.

In regard to "the exception of the family of Peisistratus from the most comprehensive decrees of amnesty passed in later times," I will also remark, that in the decree of amnesty there is no mention of them by name, nor any special exception made against them: among a list of various categories excepted, those are named "who have been condemned to death or exile either as murderers or as despots" (ἢ σφαγεῦσιν ἢ τυράννοις, Andokid. c. 13). It is by no means certain that the *descendants* of Peisistratus would be comprised in this exception, which mentions only the person himself condemned; but even if this were otherwise, the exception is a mere continuance of similar words of exception in the old Solonian law, anterior to Peisistratus; and therefore affords no indication of particular feeling against the Peisistratids.

Andokidês is a useful authority for the politics of Athens in his own time (between 420—390 B.C.), but in regard to the previous history of Athens between 510—480 B.C., his assertions are so loose, confused, and unscrupulous, that he is a witness of no value. The mere circumstance noted by Valckenaer, that he has confounded together Marathôn and Salamis, would be sufficient to show this. But when we add to such genuine ignorance his mention of his two great-grandfathers in prominent and victorious leadership, which it is hardly credible that they could ever have occupied—when we recollect that the facts which he alleges to have preceded and accompanied the expulsion of the Peisistratids are not only at variance with those stated by Herodotus, but so contrived as to found a factitious analogy for the cause which he is himself pleading—we shall hardly be able to acquit him of something worse than ignorance in his deposition.

## CHAPTER XXXI.

### GRECIAN AFFAIRS AFTER THE EXPULSION OF THE PEISISTRATIDS.—REVOLUTION OF KLEISTHENES AND ESTABLISHMENT OF DEMOCRACY AT ATHENS.

State of Athens after the expulsion of Hippias.

WITH Hippias disappeared the mercenary Thracian garrison, upon which he and his father before him had leaned for defence as well as for enforcement of authority. Kleomenês with his Lacedæmonian forces retired also, after staying only long enough to establish a personal friendship, productive subsequently of important consequences, between the Spartan king and the Athenian Isagoras. The Athenians were thus left to themselves, without any foreign interference to constrain them in their political arrangements.

It has been mentioned in the preceding chapter, that the Peisistratids had for the most part respected the forms of the Solonian constitution. The nine archons, and the probouleutic or preconsidering Senate of Four Hundred (both annually changed), still continued to subsist, together with occasional meetings of the people—or rather of such portion of the people as was comprised in the gentes, phratries, and four Ionic tribes. The timocratic classification of Solôn (or quadruple scale of income and admeasurement of political franchises according to it) also continued to subsist—but all within the tether and subservient to the purposes of the ruling family, who always kept one of their number, as real master, among the chief administrators, and always retained possession of the acropolis as well as of the mercenary force.

That overawing pressure being now removed by the expulsion of Hippias, the enslaved forms became at once endued with freedom and reality. There appeared again, what Attica had not

known for thirty years, declared political parties, and pronounced opposition between two men as leaders—on one side, Isagoras son of Tisander, a person of illustrious descent—on the other Kleisthenês the Alkmæônid, not less illustrious, and possessing at this moment a claim on the gratitude of his countrymen as the most persevering as well as the most effective foe of the dethroned despots. In what manner such opposition was carried on, we are not told. It would seem to have been not altogether pacific; but at any rate, Kleisthenês had the worst of it, and in consequence of his defeat (says the historian), "he took into partnership the people, who had been before excluded from everything".[1] His partnership with the people gave birth to the Athenian democracy: it was a real and important revolution.

Opposing party-leaders—Kleisthenês—Isagoras.

The political franchise, or the character of an Athenian citizen, both before and since Solôn, had been confined to the primitive four Ionic tribes, each of which was an aggregate of so many close corporations or quasi-families —the gentes and the phratries. None of the residents in Attica, therefore, except those included in some gens or phratry, had any part in the political franchise. Such non-privileged residents were probably at all times numerous, and became more and more so by means of fresh settlers. Moreover they tended most to multiply in Athens and Peiræus, where immigrants would commonly establish themselves. Kleisthenês, breaking down the existing wall of privilege, imparted the political franchise to the excluded mass. But this could not be done by enrolling them in new gentes or phratries, created in addition to the old. For the gentile tie was founded upon old faith and feeling which in the existing state of the Greek mind could not be suddenly conjured up as a bond of union for comparative strangers. It could only be done by disconnecting the franchise altogether from the Ionic tribes as well as from the gentes which constituted them, and by redistributing the population into new tribes with a character and purpose exclusively political. Accordingly Kleisthenês abolished the four Ionic tribes, and created

Democratical revolution headed by Kleisthenês.

[1] Herodot. v. 66—69. ἐσσούμενος δὲ ὁ Κλεισθένης τὸν δῆμον προσεταιρίζεται —ὡς γὰρ δὴ τὸν Ἀθηναίων δῆμον, πρότερον ἀπωσμένον πάντων, τότε πρὸς τὴν ἑωϋτοῦ μοίρην προσεθήκατο, &c.

in their place ten new tribes founded upon a different principle, independent of the gentes and phratries. Each of his new tribes comprised a certain number of demes or cantons, with the enrolled proprietors and residents in each of them. The demes taken altogether included the entire surface of Attica, so that the Kleisthenean constitution admitted to the potitical franchise all the free native Athenians; and not merely these, but also many metics, and even some of the superior order of slaves.[1] Putting out of sight the general body of slaves, and regarding only the free inhabitants, it was in point of fact a scheme approaching to universal suffrage, both political and judicial.

Re-arrangement and extension of the political franchise. Formation of ten new tribes, including an increased number of the population.

The slight and cursory manner in which Herodotus announces this memorable revolution tends to make us overlook its real importance. He dwells chiefly on the alteration in the number and names of the tribes; Kleisthenês, he says, despised the Ionians so much, that he would not tolerate the continuance in Attica of the four tribes which prevailed in the Ionic cities,[2] deriving their names from the four sons of Iôn—just as his grandfather the Sikyonian Kleisthenês, hating the Dorians, had degraded and nicknamed the three Dorian tribes at Sikyôn. Such is the representation of Herodotus, who seems himself to have entertained some contempt for the Ionians,[3] and therefore

Imperfect description of this event by Herodotus—its real bearing.

[1] Aristot. Polit. iii. 1, 10; vi. 2, 11. Κλεισθενης—πολλους ἐφυλέτευσε ξένους καὶ δούλους μετοίκους.

Several able critics, and Dr. Thirlwall among the number, consider this passage as affording no sense, and assume some conjectural emendation to be indispensable; though there is no particular emendation which suggests itself as pre-eminently plausible. Under these circumstances, I rather prefer to make the best of the words as they stand; which, though unusual, seem to me not absolutely inadmissible. The expression ξένος μέτοικος (which is a perfectly good one, as we find in Aristoph. Equit. 347—εἶπον δικαιότον εἶπας εὖ κατὰ ξένον μετοίκον) may be considered as the correlative to δούλους μετοίκους—the last word being construed both with δούλους and with ξένους. I apprehend that there always must have been in Attica a certain number of intelligent slaves living apart from their masters (χωρὶς οἰκοῦντες), in a state between slavery and freedom, working partly on condition of a fixed payment to him, partly for themselves, and perhaps continuing to pass nominally as slaves after they had bought their liberty by instalments. Such men would be δοῦλοι μέτοικοι: indeed there are cases in which δοῦλοι signifies *freedmen* (Meier, De Gentilitate Attica, p. 6): they must have been industrious and pushing men, valuable partisans to a political revolution. See K. F. Hermann, Lehrbuch der Griech. Staatsalterth. ch. 111, not. 15.

[2] Herodot. v. 69. Κλεισθένης—ὑπεριδὼν Ἴωνας, ἵνα μὴ σφίσι αἱ αὐταὶ ἔωσι φυλαὶ καὶ Ἴωσι.

[3] Such a disposition seems evident in Herodot. i. 143.

to have suspected a similar feeling where it had no real existence.

But the scope of Kleisthenês was something far more extensive. He abolished the four ancient tribes, not because they were Ionic, but because they had become incommensurate with the existing condition of the Attic people, and because such abolition procured both for himself and for his political scheme new as well as hearty allies. And, indeed, if we study the circumstances of the case, we shall see very obvious reasons to suggest the proceeding. For more than thirty years—an entire generation—the old constitution had been a mere empty formality, working only in subservience to the reigning dynasty, and stripped of all real controlling power. We may be very sure, therefore, that both the Senate of Four Hundred and the popular assembly, divested of that free speech which imparted to them not only all their value but all their charm, had come to be of little public estimation, and were probably attended only by a few partizans. Under such circumstances, the difference between qualified citizens and men not so qualified—between members of the four old tribes and men not members—became during this period practically effaced. This in fact was the only species of good which a Grecian despotism ever seems to have done. It confounded the privileged and the non-privileged under one coercive authority common to both, so that the distinction between the two was not easy to revive when the despotism passed away. As soon as Hippias was expelled, the senate and the public assembly regained their efficiency; but had they been continued on the old footing, including none but members of the four tribes, these tribes would have been re-invested with a privilege which in reality they had so long lost, that its revival would have seemed an odious novelty, and the remaining population would probably not have submitted to it. If in addition we consider the political excitement of the moment—the restoration of one body of men from exile, and the departure of another body into exile—the outpouring of long-suppressed hatred, partly against these very forms by the corruption of which the despot had reigned—we shall see that prudence as well as patriotism dictated the adoption of an enlarged scheme of government. Kleisthenês had learnt some wisdom during his long exile; and as he probably continued for

some time after the introduction of his new constitution to be the chief adviser of his countrymen, we may consider their extraordinary success as a testimony to his prudence and skill, not less than to their courage and unanimity.

Nor does it seem unreasonable to give him credit for a more generous forward movement than what is implied in the literal account of Herodotus. Instead of being forced against his will to purchase popular support by proposing this new constitution, Kleisthenês may have proposed it before, during the discussions which immediately followed the retirement of Hippias; so that the rejection of it formed the ground of quarrel (and no other ground is mentioned) between him and Isagoras. The latter doubtless found sufficient support, in the existing senate and public assembly, to prevent it from being carried without an actual appeal to the people. His opposition to it, moreover, is not difficult to understand; for necessary as the change had become, it was not the less a shock to ancient Attic ideas. It radically altered the very idea of a tribe, which now became an aggregation of demes, of gentes—of fellow-demots, not of fellow-gentiles. It thus broke up those associations, religious, social, and political, between the whole and the parts of the old system, which operated powerfully on the mind of every old-fashioned Athenian. The patricians at Rome who composed the gentes and curiæ—and the plebs, who had no part in these corporations—formed for a long time two separate and opposing fractions in the same city, each with its own separate organisation. Only by slow degrees did the plebs gain ground, while the political value of the patrician gens was long maintained alongside of and apart from the plebeian tribe. So too, in the Italian and German cities of the middle ages, the patrician families refused to part with their own separate political identity when the guilds grew up by the side of them; even though forced to renounce a portion of their power, they continued to be a separate fraternity, and would not submit to be regimented anew, under an altered category and denomination, along with the traders who had grown into wealth and importance.[1] But the reform of

Grounds of opposition to it in ancient Athenian feeling.

[1] In illustration of what is here stated, see the account of the modifications of the constitution of Zürich, in Bluntschli, Staats- und Rechts-

Kleisthenês effected this change all at once, both as to the name and as to the reality. In some cases, indeed, that which had been the name of a gens was retained as the name of a deme, but even then the old gentiles were ranked indiscriminately among the remaining demots. The Athenian people, politically considered, thus became one homogeneous whole, distributed for convenience into parts, numerical, local, and politically equal. It is however to be remembered, that while the four Ionic tribes were abolished, the gentes and phratries which composed them were left untouched, continuing to subsist as family and religious associations, though carrying with them no political privilege.

The ten newly-created tribes, arranged in an established order of precedence, were called—Erechthêis, Ægêis, Pandiônis, Leontis, Akamantis, Œnêis, Kekrôpis, Hippothoontis, Æantis, Antiochis; names borrowed chiefly from the respected heroes of Attic legend. This number remained unaltered until the year 305 B.C., when it was increased to twelve by the addition of two new tribes, Antigonias and Demetrias, afterwards designated anew by the names of Ptolemais and Attalis: the mere names of these last two, borrowed from living kings, and not from legendary heroes, betray the change from freedom to subservience at Athens. Each tribe comprised a certain number of demes—cantons, parishes, or townships—in Attica. But the total number of these demes is not distinctly ascertained; for though we know that in the time of Polemô (the third century B.C.) it was one hundred and seventy-four, we cannot be sure that it had always remained the same; and several critics construe the words of Herodotus to imply that Kleisthenês at first recognised exactly one hundred demes, distributed in equal proportion among his ten tribes.[1]

Names of the tribes —their relation to the demes.

Geschichte der Stadt Zürich, book iii. ch. 2, p. 322; also, Kortüm, Entstehungs-Geschichte der Freistädtischen Bünde im Mittelalter, ch. 5, p. 74—75.

[1] Herodot. v. 69. *δέκα δὲ καὶ τοὺς δήμους κατένεμε ἐς τὰς φυλάς.*

Schömann contends that Kleisthenês established exactly one hundred demes to the ten tribes (De Comitiis Atheniensium, Præf. p. xv. and p. 363, and Antiquitat. Jur. Pub. Græc. ch. xxii. p. 260), and K. F. Hermann (Lehrbuch der Griech. Staatsalt. ch. 111) thinks that this is what Herodotus meant to affirm, though he does not believe the fact to have really stood so.

There is a difficulty in the construction of these words—*δέκα δὲ καὶ τοὺς δήμους κατένεμε ἐς τὰς φυλάς.* In my former edition, I followed many commentators, in joining *δέκα* with *φυλάς*; which, though it brings out the sense required, is embarrassing from the position of the words. Mr. Scott (of Trinity College, Cambridge) has pointed out what seems a better construction,

Such construction of the words however is more than doubtful, while the fact itself is improbable; partly because if the change of number had been so considerable as the difference between one hundred and one hundred and seventy-four, some positive evidence of it would probably be found — partly because Kleisthenês would indeed have a motive to render the amount of citizen population nearly equal, but no motive to render the number of demes equal, in each of the ten tribes. It is well known how great is the force of local habits, and how unalterable are parochial or cantonal boundaries. In the absence of proof to the contrary, therefore, we may reasonably suppose the number and circumscription of the demes, as found or modified by Kleisthenês, to have subsisted afterwards with little alteration, at least until the increase in the number of the tribes.

There is another point, however, which is at once more certain and more important to notice. The demes which Kleisthenês assigned to each tribe were in no case all adjacent to each other: and therefore the tribe, as a whole, did not correspond with any continuous portion of the territory, nor could it have any peculiar local interest, separate from the entire community. Such systematic avoidance of the factions arising out of neighbourhood will appear to have been more especially necessary, when we recollect that the quarrels of the Parali, the Diakrii, the Pediaki, during the preceding century, had all been generated from local feud, though doubtless artfully fomented by individual ambition. Moreover it was only by this same precaution that the local predominance of the city, and the formation of a city-interest distinct from that of the country, was obviated; which could hardly have failed to arise had the city by itself constituted either one deme or one tribe. Kleisthenês distributed the city (or found it already distributed) into several demes, and those demes among several tribes; while Peiræus and Phalêrum, each constituting a separate deme, were also assigned to different tribes; so that there were no local advantages either to bestow

Demes belonging to each tribe usually not adjacent to each other.

bringing out the same sense. He joins δέκα, not with φυλάς, but with κατενεμε, upon the analogy of various passages— Xenophôn, Cyropæd. vii. 5, 3, τό στράτευμα κατένειμε δώδεκα μέρη—Plato, Politicus. p. 283 D, διέλωμεν τοίνυν αὐτὴν δύο μέρη—Herodotus, vii. 121, τρεῖς μοίρας ὁ Ξέρξης δασάμενος πάντα τὸν πέζον στρατόν—and various other passages.

predominance, or to create a struggle for predominance, of one tribe over the rest.[1] Each deme had its own local interests to watch over; but the tribe was a mere aggregate of demes for political, military, and religious purposes, with no separate hopes or fears apart from the whole state. Each tribe had a chapel, sacred rites and festivals, and a common fund for such meetings, in honour of its eponymous hero, administered by members of its own choice:[2] and the statues of all the ten eponymous heroes, fraternal patrons of the democracy, were planted in the most conspicuous part of the agora of Athens. In the future working of the Athenian government we shall trace no symptom of disquieting local factions—a capital amendment, compared with the disputes of the preceding century, and traceable in part to the absence of border-relations between demes of the same tribe.

The deme now became the primitive constituent element of the commonwealth, both as to persons and as to property. It had its own demarch, its register of enrolled citizens, its collective property, its public meetings and religious ceremonies, its taxes levied and administered by itself. The register of qualified citizens[3] was kept by the demarch, and the inscription of new citizens took place at the assembly of the demots, whose legitimate sons were enrolled on attaining the

Arrangements and functions of the deme.

[1] The deme *Melitê* belonged to the tribe Kekropis; *Kollytus*, to the tribe Ægêis; *Kydathenæon*, to the tribe Pandionis; *Kerameis*, or *Kerameikus*, to the Akamantis; *Skambônidæ*, to the Leontis.

All these five were demes within the city of Athens, and all belonged to different tribes.

*Peirœus* belonged to the Hippothoontis; *Phalêrum*, to the Æantis; *Xypetê*, to the Kekropis; *Thymœtadæ*, to the Hippothoontis. These four demes, adjoining to each other, formed a sort of quadruple local union, for festivals and other purposes, among themselves; though three of them belonged to different tribes.

See the list of the Attic demes, with a careful statement of their localities in so far as ascertained, in Professor Ross, Die Demen von Attika, Halle, 1846. The distribution of the city-demes, and of Peirœus and Phalêrum, among different tribes, appears to me a clear proof of the intention of the original distributors. It shows that they wished from the beginning to make the demes constituting each tribe discontinuous, and that they desired to prevent both the growth of separate tribe-interests and ascendency of one tribe over the rest: it contradicts the belief of those who suppose that the tribe was at first composed of continuous demes, and that the breach of continuity arose from subsequent changes.

Of course there were many cases in which adjoining demes belonged to the same tribe; but not one of the ten tribes was made up altogether of adjoining demes.

[2] See Boeckh, Corp. Inscriptt. No. 85, 128, 213, &c.

[3] We may remark that this register was called by a special name, the Lexiarchic register; while the primitive register of phrators and gentiles always retained, even in the time of the orators, its original name of *the common register*.—Harpokratiôn, v. Κοινὸν γραμματεῖον καὶ ληξιαρχικόν.

age of eighteen, and their adopted sons at any time when presented and sworn to by the adopting citizen. The citizenship could only be granted by a public vote of the people, but wealthy non-freemen were enabled sometimes to evade this law and purchase admission upon the register of some poor deme, probably by means of a fictitious adoption. At the meetings of the demots, the register was called over, and it sometimes happened that some names were expunged, in which case the party thus disfranchised had an appeal to the popular judicature.[1] So great was the local administrative power, however, of these demes, that they are described as the substitute,[2] under the Kleisthenean system, for the Naukraries under the Solonian and ante-Solonian. The Trittyes and Naukraries, though nominally preserved, and the latter augmented in number from forty-eight to fifty, appear henceforward as of little public importance.

Solonian constitution preserved with modifications.

Kleisthenês preserved, but at the same time modified and expanded, all the main features of Solôn's political constitution; the public assembly or Ekklesia—the pre-considering senate composed of members from all the tribes—and the habit of annual election, as well as annual responsibility of magistrates, by and to the Ekklesia. The full value must now have been felt of possessing such pre-existing institutions to build upon, at a moment of perplexity and dissension. But the Kleisthenean Ekklesia acquired new strength, and almost a new character, from the great increase of the number of citizens qualified to attend it; while the annually-changed senate, instead of being composed of four hundred members taken in equal proportion from each of the old four tribes, was enlarged to five hundred, taken equally from each of the new ten tribes. It now comes before us, under the name of Senate of Five Hundred, as an active and indispensable body throughout the whole Athenian democracy: moreover the practice now seems to have begun (though the period of commencement cannot be decisively proved) of determining the

[1] See Schömann, Antiq. Jur. P. Græc. ch. xxiv. The oration of Demosthenês against Eubulidês is instructive about these proceedings of the assembled demots: compare Harpokratiôn, v. Διαψήφισις, and Meier, De Bonis Damnatorum, ch. xii. p. 78, &c.

[2] Aristot. Fragment. de Republ., ed. Neumann—Ἀθην. πολιτ. Fr. 40, p. 88: Schol. ad Aristophan. Ran. 37; Harpokratiôn, v. Δήμαρχος — Ναυκραρικά; Photius, v. Ναυκραρία.

names of the senators by lot. Both the senate thus constituted and the public assembly were far more popular and vigorous than they had been under the original arrangement of Solôn.

The new constitution of the tribes, as it led to a change in the annual senate, so it transformed no less directly the military arrangements of the state, both as to soldiers and as to officers. The citizens called upon to serve in arms were now marshalled according to tribes—each tribe having its own taxiarchs as officers for the hoplites, and its own phylarch at the head of the horsemen. Moreover there were now created, for the first time, ten stratêgi or generals, one from each tribe; and two hipparchs, for the supreme command of the horsemen. Under the prior Athenian constitution it appears that the command of the military force had been vested in the third archon or polemarch, no stratêgi then existing. Even after the stratêgi had been created, under the Kleisthenean constitution, the polemarch still retained a joint right of command along with them—as we are told at the battle of Marathôn, where Kallimachus the polemarch not only enjoyed an equal vote in the council of war along with the ten stratêgi, but even occupied the post of honour on the right wing.[1] The ten generals, annually changed, are thus (like the ten tribes) a fruit of the Kleisthenean constitution, which was at the same time powerfully strengthened and protected by this remodelling of the military force. The functions of the generals became more extensive as the democracy advanced, so that they seem to have acquired gradually not merely the direction of military and naval affairs, but also that of the foreign relations of the city generally—while the nine archons, including the polemarch, were by degrees lowered down from that full executive and judicial competence which they had once enjoyed, to the simple ministry of police and preparatory justice. Encroached upon by the stratêgi on one side, they were also restricted in efficiency, on the other side, by the rise of the popular dikasteries or numerous jury-courts. We may be sure that these popular dikasteries had not been permitted to meet or to act under the despotism of the Peisistratids, and that the judicial business of the city must then have been conducted partly by the senate of Areopagus, partly by

Change of military arrangement in the state. The ten stratêgi or generals.

[1] Herodot. vi. 109—111.

the archons; perhaps with a nominal responsibility of the latter, at the end of their year of office, to an acquiescent Ekklesia. And if we even assume it to be true, as some writers contend, that the habit of direct popular judicature (over and above this annual trial of responsibility) had been partially introduced by Solôn, it must have been discontinued during the long coercion exercised by the supervening dynasty. But the outburst of popular spirit, which lent force to Kleisthenês, doubtless carried the people into direct action as jurors in the aggregate Heliæa, not less than as voters in the Ekklesia; and the change was thus begun which contributed to degrade the archons from their primitive character as judges, into the lower function of preliminary examiners and presidents of a jury. Such convocation of numerous juries, beginning first with the aggregate body of sworn citizens above thirty years of age, and subsequently dividing them into separate bodies or pannels for trying particular causes, became gradually more frequent and more systematised; until at length, in the time of Periklês, it was made to carry a small pay, and stood out as one of the most prominent features of Athenian life. We cannot particularise the different steps whereby such final development was attained, and whereby the judicial competence of the archon was cut down to the mere power of inflicting a small fine. But the first steps of it are found in the revolution of Kleisthenês, and it seems to have been consummated after the battle of Platæa. Of the function exercised by the nine archons, as well as by many other magistrates and official persons at Athens, in convoking a dikastery or jury-court, bringing on causes for trial, and presiding over the trial—a function constituting one of the marks of superior magistracy, and called the Hegemony or presidency of a dikastery—I shall speak more at length hereafter. At present I wish merely to bring to view the increased and increasing sphere of action on which the people entered at the memorable turn of affairs now before us.

The judicial assembly of citizens—or Heliæa—subsequently divided into bodies judging apart. The political assembly, or Ekklesia.

The financial affairs of the city underwent at this epoch as complete a change as the military. The appointment of magistrates and officers by tens, one from each tribe, seems to have become the ordinary practice. A board

Financial arrangements.

of ten, called Apodektæ, were invested with the supreme management of the exchequer, dealing with the contractors as to those portions of the revenue which were farmed, receiving all the taxes from the collectors, and disbursing them under competent authority. Of this board the first nomination is expressly ascribed to Kleisthenês,[1] as a substitute for certain persons called Kôlakretæ, who had performed the same function before and who were now retained only for subordinate services. The duties of the Apodektæ were afterwards limited to receiving the public income, and paying it over to the ten treasurers of the goddess Athênê, by whom it was kept in the inner chamber of the Parthenôn, and disbursed as needed ; but this more complicated arrangement cannot be referred to Kleisthenês. From his time forward, too, the Senate of Five Hundred steps far beyond its original duty of preparing matters for the discussion of the Ekklesia. It embraces, besides, a large circle of administrative and general superintendence, which hardly admits of any definition. Its sittings become constant, with the exception of special holidays. The year is distributed into ten portions called Prytanies—the fifty senators of each tribe taking by turns the duty of constant attendance during one prytany, and receiving during that time the title of The Prytanes : the order of precedence among the tribes in these duties was annually determined by lot. In the ordinary Attic year of twelve lunar months, or 354 days, six of the prytanies contained thirty-five days, four of them contained thirty-six : in the intercalated years of thirteen months, the number of days was thirty-eight and thirty-nine respectively. Moreover a farther subdivision of the prytany into five periods of seven days each, and of the fifty tribe-senators into five bodies of ten each, was recognised. Each body of ten presided in the senate for one period of seven days, drawing lots every day among their number for a new chairman called Epistatês, to whom during his day of office were confided the keys of the acropolis and the treasury, together with the city seal. The remaining senators, not belonging to the prytanising tribe, might of course attend if they chose. But the attendance of nine among them, one from each of the remaining

Senate of Five Hundred.

[1] Harpokratiôn, v. Ἀποδέκται.

nine tribes, was imperatively necessary to constitute a valid meeting, and to ensure a constant representation of the collective people.

*Ekklesia, or political assembly.*

During those later times known to us through the great orators, the Ekklesia, or formal assembly of the citizens, was convoked four times regularly during each prytany, or oftener if necessity required—usually by the senate, though the stratêgi had also the power of convoking it by their own authority. It was presided over by the prytanes, and questions were put to the vote by their Epistatês, or chairman. But the nine representatives of the non-prytanising tribes were always present as a matter of course, and seem indeed in the days of the orators to have acquired to themselves the direction of it, together with the right of putting questions for the vote[1]—setting aside wholly or partially the fifty prytanes. When we carry our attention back, however, to the state of the Ekklesia, as first organised by Kleisthenês (I have already remarked that expositors of the Athenian constitution are too apt to neglect the distinction of times, and to suppose that what was the practice between 400—330 B.C. had been always the practice), it will appear probable that he provided one regular meeting in each prytany, and no more; giving to the senate and the stratêgi power of convening special meetings if needful, but establishing one Ekklesia during each prytany, or ten in the year, as a regular necessity of state. How often the ancient Ekklesia had been convoked during the interval between Solôn and Peisistratus, we cannot exactly say—probably but seldom during the year. Under the Peisistratids, its convocation had dwindled down into an inoperative formality. Hence the re-establishment of it by Kleisthenês, not merely with plenary determining powers, but also under full notice and preparation of matters beforehand, together with the best securities for orderly procedure, was in itself a revolution impressive to the mind of every Athenian citizen. To render the Ekklesia efficient, it was indispensable that its meetings should be both frequent and free. Men were thus trained to the duty both of speakers and hearers, and each man, while he felt that he exercised his

[1] See the valuable treatise of Schömann, De Comitiis, *passim*; also his Antiq. Jur. Publ. Gr. ch. xxxi.; Harpokratiôn, v. Κυρία Ἐκκλησία; Pollux, viii. 95.

share of influence on the decision, identified his own safety and happiness with the vote of the majority, and became familiarised with the notion of a sovereign authority which he neither could nor ought to resist. This was an idea new to the Athenian bosom. With it came the feelings sanctifying free speech and equal law—words which no Athenian citizen ever afterwards heard unmoved: together with that sentiment of the entire commonwealth as one and indivisible, which always overruled, though it did not supplant, the local and cantonal specialities. It is not too much to say that these patriotic and ennobling impulses were a new product in the Athenian mind, to which nothing analogous occurs even in the time of Solôn. They were kindled in part doubtless by the strong reaction against the Peisistratids, but still more by the fact that the opposing leader, Kleisthenês, turned that transitory feeling to the best possible account, and gave to it a vigorous perpetuity, as well as a well-defined positive object, by the popular elements conspicuous in his constitution. His name makes less figure in history than we should expect, because he passed for the mere renovator of Solôn's scheme of government after it had been overthrown by Peisistratus. Probably he himself professed this object, since it would facilitate the success of his propositions: and if we confine ourselves to the letter of the case, the fact is in a great measure true, since the annual senate and the Ekklesia are both Solonian; but both of them under his reform were clothed in totally new circumstances, and swelled into gigantic proportions. How vigorous was the burst of Athenian enthusiasm, altering instantaneously the position of Athens among the powers of Greece, we shall hear presently from the lips of Herodotus, and shall find still more unequivocally marked in the facts of his history.

Kleisthenês the real author of the Athenian democracy.

But it was not only the people formally installed in their Ekklesia, who received from Kleisthenês the real attributes of sovereignty—it was by him also that the people were first called into direct action as dikasts or jurors. I have already remarked that this custom may be said, in a certain limited sense, to have begun in the time of Solôn, since that lawgiver invested the popular assembly with the power of pronouncing the judgment of

Judicial attributes of the people—their gradual enlargement.

accountability upon the archons after their year of office. Here again the building, afterwards so spacious and stately, was erected on a Solonian foundation, though it was not itself Solonian. That the popular dikasteries, in the elaborate form in which they existed from Periklês downward, were introduced all at once by Kleisthenês, it is impossible to believe. Yet the steps by which they were gradually wrought out are not distinctly discoverable. It would rather seem, that at first only the aggregate body of citizens above thirty years of age exercised judicial functions, being specially convoked and sworn to try persons accused of public crimes, and when so employed bearing the name of the Heliæa, or Heliasts; private offences and disputes between man and man being still determined by individual magistrates in the city, and a considerable judicial power still residing in the Senate of Areopagus. There is reason to believe that this was the state of things established by Kleisthenês, which afterwards came to be altered by the greater extent of judicial duty gradually accruing to the Heliasts, so that it was necessary to subdivide the collective Heliæa.

According to the subdivision, as practised in the times best known, 6000 citizens above thirty years of age were annually selected by lot out of the whole number, 600 from each of the ten tribes: 5000 of these citizens were arranged in ten pannels or decuries of 500 each, the remaining 1000 being reserved to fill up vacancies in case of death or absence among the former. The whole 6000 took a prescribed oath, couched in very striking words: after which every man received a ticket inscribed with his own name as well as with a letter designating his decury. When there were causes or crimes ripe for trial, the Thesmothetæ or six inferior archons determined by lot, first, which decuries should sit, according to the number wanted—next, in which court, or under the presidency of what magistrate, the decury B or E should sit, so that it could not be known beforehand in what cause each would be judge. In the number of persons who actually attended and sat, however, there seems to have been much variety, and sometimes two decuries sat together.[1] The

[1] See in particular on this subject the treatise of Schömann, De Sortitione Judicum (Greifswald, 1820), and the work of the same author, Antiq. Jur. Publ. Græc. ch. 49—55, p. 264 *seqq.*; also Heffter, Die Athenäische Gerichts-

arrangement here described, we must recollect, is given to us as belonging to those times when the dikasts received a regular pay, after every day's sitting; and it can hardly have long continued without that condition, which was not realised before the time of Periklês. Each of these decuries sitting in judicature was called *the Heliæa*—a name which belongs properly to the collective assembly of the people; this collective assembly having been itself the original judicature. I conceive that the practice of distributing this collective assembly or Heliæa into sections of jurors for judicial duty may have begun under one form or another soon after the reform of Kleisthenês, since the direct interference of the people in public affairs tended more and more to increase. But it could only have been matured by degrees into that constant and systematic service which the pay of Periklês called forth at last in completeness. Under the last mentioned system the judicial competence of the archons was annulled, and the third archon or polemarch withdrawn from all military functions. But this had not been yet done at the time of the battle of Marathôn, where Kallimachus the polemarch not only commanded along with the stratêgi, but enjoyed a sort of pre-eminence over them: nor had it been done during the year after the battle of Marathôn, in which Aristeidês was archon—for the magisterial decisions of Aristeidês formed one of the principal foundations of his honourable surname, the Just.[1]

With this question as to the comparative extent of judicial power vested by Kleisthenês in the popular dikastery and the archons, are in reality connected two others in Athenian constitutional law; relating first, to the admissibility of all citizens

verfassung, part ii. ch. 2, p. 51 *seqq.*; Meier und Schömann, Der Attische Prozess, p. 127—135.

The views of Schömann respecting the sortition of the Athenian jurors have been bitterly attacked, but in noway refuted, by F. V. Fritzsche (De Sortitione Judicum apud Athenienses Commentatio, Leipsic, 1835).

Two or three of these dikastic tickets, marking the name and the deme of the citizen, and the letter of the decury to which during that particular year he belonged, have been recently dug up near Athens:—

Δ. Διόδωρος Φρεάρριος. Ε. Δεινίας Ἀλαιεύς.

(Boeckh, Corp. Inscrip. No. 207, 208.)

Fritzsche (p. 73) considers these to be tickets of senators, not of dikasts; contrary to all probability.

For the Heliastic oath, and its remarkable particulars, see Demosthen. cont. Timokrat. p. 746. See also Aristophanês, Plutus, 277 (with the valuable Scholia, though from different hands and not all of equal correctness) and 972; Ekklesiazusæ, 678 *seq.*

[1] Plutarch, Arist. 7; Herodot. vi. 109—111.

for the post of archon—next, to the choosing of archons by lot.

Three points in Athenian constitutional law, hanging together:—Universal admissibility of citizens—Choice by lot—Reduced functions of the magistrates chosen by lot.

It is well known that in the time of Periklês, the archons, and various other individual functionaries, had come to be chosen by lot; moreover all citizens were legally admissible, and might give in their names to be drawn for by lot, subject to what was called the Dokimasy, or legal examination into their status of citizen, and into various moral and religious qualifications, before they took office; while at the same time the function of the archon had become nothing higher than preliminary examination of parties and witnesses for the dikastery, and presidence over it when afterwards assembled, together with the power of imposing by authority a fine of small amount upon inferior offenders. Now all these three political arrangements hang essentially together. The great value of the lot, according to Grecian democratical ideas, was that it equalised the chance of office between rich and poor; but so long as the poor citizens were legally inadmissible, choice by lot could have no recommendation either to the rich or to the poor. In fact, it would be less democratical than election by the general mass of citizens, because the poor citizen would under the latter system enjoy an important right of interference by means of his suffrage, though he could not be elected himself.[1] Again, choice by lot could

[1] Aristotle puts these two together; election of magistrates by the mass of the citizens, but only out of persons possessing a high pecuniary qualification: this he ranks as the least democratical democracy, if one may use the phrase (Politic. iii. 6—11), or a mean between democracy and oligarchy—an ἀριστοκρατία or πολιτεία in his sense of the word (iv. 7, 3). He puts the employment of the lot as a symptom of decisive and extreme democracy, such as would never tolerate a pecuniary qualification of eligibility.

So again Plato (Legg. iii. p. 692), after remarking that the legislator of Sparta first provided the senate, next the ephors, as a bridle upon the kings, says of the ephors that they were "something nearly approaching to an authority emanating from the lot"—οἷον ψάλιον ἐνέβαλεν αὐτῇ τὴν τῶν ἐφόρων δύναμιν, ἐγγὺς τῆς κληρωτῆς ἀγαγὼν δυνάμεως.

Upon which passage there are some good remarks in Schömann's edition of Plutarch's Lives of Agis and Kleomenês (Comment. ad Ag. c. 8, p. 119). It is to be recollected that the actual mode in which the Spartan ephors were chosen, as I have already stated in my first volume, cannot be clearly made out, and has been much debated by critics:—

"Mihi hæc verba, quum illud quidem manifestum faciant, quod etiam aliunde constat, sorte captos ephoros non esse, tum hoc alterum quod Hermannus statuit, creationem sortitioni non absimilem fuisse, nequaquam demonstrare videntur. Nimirum nihil aliud nisi prope accedere ephororum magistratus ad eos dicitur, qui sortito capiantur. *Sortitis autem magistratibus hoc maxime proprium est, ut promiscue—non ex genere, censu, dignitate—a quolibet capi possint:* quamobrem quum ephori quoque fere promiscue fierent ex omni

never under any circumstances be applied to those posts where special competence, and a certain measure of attributes possessed only by a few, were indispensable; nor was it ever applied throughout the whole history of democratical Athens to the stratêgi or generals, who were always elected by show of hands of the assembled citizens. Accordingly, we may regard it as certain, that at the time when the archons first came to be chosen by lot, the superior and responsible duties once attached to that office had been, or were in course of being, detached from it, and transferred either to the popular dikasts or to the ten elected stratêgi: so that there remained to these archons only a routine of police and administration, important indeed to the state, yet such as could be executed by any citizen of average probity, diligence, and capacity—at least there was no obvious absurdity in thinking so; while the Dokimasy excluded from the office men of notoriously discreditable life, even after they might have drawn the successful lot. Periklês,[1] though chosen stratêgus year after year successively, was never archon; and it may be doubted whether men of first-rate talents and ambition often gave in their names for the office. To those of smaller aspirations[2] it was doubtless a source of importance, but it imposed troublesome labour, gave no pay, and entailed a certain degree of peril upon any archon who might have given offence to powerful men, when he came to pass through the trial of accountability which followed immediately upon his year of office. There was little to make the office acceptable, either to very poor men, or to very rich and ambitious men; and between the middling persons who gave in their names, any one might be taken without great practical mischief, always assuming the two guarantees of the Dokimasy before and accountability after office. This was the conclusion—in my opinion a mistaken conclusion, and such as

multitudine civium, poterat haud dubie magistratus eorum ἐγγὺς τῆς κληρωτῆς δυνάμεως esse dici, etiamsi αἱρετοί essent—h. e. suffragiis creati. Et videō Lachmannum quoque p. 165, not. 1, de Platonis loco similiter judicare."

The employment of the lot, as Schömann remarks, implies universal admissibility of all citizens to office: though the converse does not hold good—the latter does not of necessity imply the former. Now as we know that universal admissibility did not become the law of Athens until after the battle of Platæa, so we may conclude that the employment of the lot had no place before that epoch—*i.e.*, had no place under the constitution of Kleisthenês.

[1] Plutarch, Periklês, c. 9—16.

[2] See a passage about such characters in Plato, Republic, v. p. 475 B.

would find no favour at present—to which the democrats of Athens were conducted by their strenuous desire to equalise the chances of office for rich and poor. But their sentiment seems to have been satisfied by a partial enforcement of the lot to the choice of some offices—especially the archons, as the primitive chief magistrates of the state—without applying it to all or to the most responsible and difficult. Hardly would they have applied it to the archons, if it had been indispensably necessary that these magistrates should retain their original very serious duty of judging disputes and condemning offenders.

I think therefore that these three points—1. The opening of the post of archon to all citizens indiscriminately; 2. The choice of archons by lot; 3. The diminished range of the archon's duties and responsibilities, through the extension of those belonging to the popular courts of justice on the one hand and to the stratêgi on the other—are all connected together, and must have been simultaneous, or nearly simultaneous, in the time of introduction: the enactment of universal admissibility to office certainly not coming after the other two, and probably coming a little before them.

Universal admissibility of citizens to the archonship—not introduced until after the battle of Platæa.

Now in regard to the eligibility of all Athenians indiscriminately to the office of archon, we find a clear and positive testimony as to the time when it was first introduced. Plutarch tells us[1] that the oligarchical,[2] but high-principled, Aristeidês was himself the proposer of this constitutional change, shortly after the battle of Platæa, with the consequent expulsion of the Persians from Greece, and the return of the refugee Athenians to their ruined city. Seldom has it happened in the history of mankind that rich and poor have been so completely equalised as among the population of Athens in that memorable expatriation and heroic struggle; nor are we at all surprised to hear that the mass of the citizens, coming back with freshly-kindled patriotism as well as with the consciousness that their country had only been recovered by the equal efforts of all, would no longer submit to be legally disqualified from any office of state. It was on this occasion

[1] Plutarch, Arist. 22.

[2] So at least the supporters of the constitution of Kleisthenês were called by the contemporaries of Periklês.

that the constitution was first made really "common" to all, and that the archons, stratègi, and all functionaries first began to be chosen from all Athenians without any difference of legal eligibility.[1] No mention is made of the lot, in this important statement of Plutarch, which appears to me every way worthy of credit, and which teaches us, that down to the invasion of Xerxês, not only had the exclusive principle of the Solonian law of qualification continued in force (whereby the first three classes on the census were alone admitted to all individual offices, and the fourth or Thêtic class excluded), but also the archons had hitherto been elected by the citizens—not taken by lot. Now for financial purposes, the quadruple census of Solôn was retained long after this period, even beyond the Peloponnesian war and the oligarchy of Thirty; but we thus learn that Kleisthenês in his constitution retained it for political purposes also in part at least. He recognised the exclusion of the great mass of the citizens from all individual offices—such as the archon, the stratêgus, &c. In his time, probably, no complaints were raised on the subject. For his constitution gave to the collective bodies—senate, ekklesia, and heliæa or dikastery—a degree of power and importance such as they had never before known or imagined. And we may well suppose that the Athenian people of that day had no objection even to the proclaimed system and theory of being exclusively governed by men of wealth and station as individual magistrates—especially since many of the newly-enfranchised citizens had been before metics and slaves. Indeed it is to be added, that even under the full democracy of later Athens, though the people had then become passionately attached to the theory of equal admissibility of all citizens to office, yet in practice poor men seldom obtained offices which were elected by the general vote, as will appear more fully in the course of this history.[2]

Constitution of Kleisthênes retained the Solonian law of exclusion as to individual office.

[1] Plutarch, Arist. *ut sup.* γράφει ψήφισμα, κοινὴν εἶναι τὴν πολιτείαν, καὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας ἐξ Ἀθηναίων πάντων αἱρεῖσθαι.

[2] So in the Italian republics of the twelfth and thirteenth century, the nobles long continued to possess the exclusive right of being elected to the consulate and the great offices of state, even after those offices had come to be elected by the people. The habitual misrule and oppression of the nobles gradually put an end to this right, and even created in many towns a resolution positively to exclude them. At Milan, towards the end of the twelfth

The choice of the stratêgi remained ever afterwards upon the footing on which Aristeidês thus placed it; but the lot for the choice of archon must have been introduced shortly after his proposition of universal eligibility, and in consequence too of the same tide of democratical feeling — introduced as a farther corrective, because the poor citizen, though he had become eligible, was nevertheless not elected. And at the same time, I imagine, that elaborate distribution of the Heliæa, or aggregate body of dikasts or jurors, into separate pannels or dikasteries for the decision of judicial matters, was first regularised. It was this change that stole away from the archons so important a part of their previous jurisdiction: it was this change that Periklês more fully consummated by ensuring pay to the dikasts.

But the present is not the time to enter into the modifications which Athens underwent during the generation after the battle of Platæa. They have been here briefly noticed for the purpose of reasoning back, in the absence of direct evidence, to Athens as it stood in the generation before that memorable battle, after the reform of Kleisthenês. His reform, though highly democratical, stopped short of the mature democracy which prevailed from Periklês to Demosthenês, in three ways especially, among various others; and it is therefore sometimes considered by the later writers as an aristocratical constitution:[1]—1. It still recognised the archons as judges to a considerable extent, and the third archon or polemarch as joint military commander along with the stratêgi. 2. It retained them as elected annually by the body of citizens, not as chosen by lot.[2] 3. It still excluded

Difference between that constitution and the political state of Athens after Periklês.

century, the twelve consuls with the Podestat possessed all the powers of government: these consuls were nominated by one hundred electors chosen by and among the people. Sismondi observes—"Cependant le peuple imposa lui-même à ces électeurs, la règle fondamentale de choisir tous les magistrats dans le corps de la noblesse. Ce n'étoit point encore la possession des magistratures que l'on contestoit aux gentils-hommes: on demandoit seulement qu'ils fussent les mandataires immédiats de la nation. Mais plus d'une fois, en dépit du droit incontestable des citoyens, les consuls regnant s'attribuèrent l'election de leurs successeurs." (Sismondi, Histoire des Républiques Italiennes, chap. xii. vol. ii. p. 240.)

[1] Plutarch, Kimôn, c. 15. τὴν ἐπὶ Κλεισθένους ἐγείρειν ἀριστοκρατίαν πειρωμένου: compare Plutarch, Aristeidês, c. 2, and Isokratês, Areopagiticus, Or. xii. p. 143, p. 192, ed. Bek.

[2] Herodotus speaks of Kallimachus the Polemarch at Marathôn as ὁ τῷ κυάμῳ λαχὼν Πολέμαρχος (vi. 110).

I cannot but think that in this case he transfers to the year 490 B.C. the practice of his own time. The polemarch at the time of the battle of

the fourth class of the Solonian census from all individual office, the archonship among the rest. The Solonian law of exclusion, however, though retained in principle, was mitigated in practice thus far—that whereas Solôn had rendered none but members of the highest class on the census (the Pentakosiomedimni) eligible to the archonship, Kleisthenês opened that dignity to all the first three classes, shutting out only the fourth. That he did this may be inferred from the fact that Aristeidês, assuredly not a rich man, became archon. I am also inclined to believe that the senate of Five Hundred as constituted by Kleisthenês was taken, not by election, but by lot, from the ten tribes—and that every citizen became eligible to it. Election for this purpose—that is, the privilege of annually electing a batch of fifty senators all at once by each tribe—would probably be thought more troublesome than valuable; nor do we hear of separate meetings of each tribe for purposes of election. Moreover the office of senator was a collective, not an individual office; the shock therefore to the feelings of semi-democratised Athens, from the unpleasant idea of a poor man sitting among the fifty prytanes, would be less than

Marathôn was in a certain sense the first stratêgus; and the stratêgi were never taken by lot, but always chosen by show of hands, even to the end of the democracy. It seems impossible to believe that the stratêgi were elected, and that the polemarch, at the time when his functions were the same as theirs, was chosen by lot.

Herodotus seems to have conceived the choice of magistrates by lot as being of the essence of a democracy (Herodot. iii. 80).

Plutarch also (Periklês, c. 9) seems to have conceived the choice of archons by lot as a very ancient institution of Athens: nevertheless it results from the first chapter of his life of Aristeidês—an obscure chapter, in which conflicting authorities are mentioned without being well discriminated—that Aristeidês was *chosen* archon by the people—not drawn by lot: an additional reason for believing this is, that he was archon in the year following the battle of Marathôn, at which he had been one of the ten generals. Idomeneus distinctly affirmed this to be the fact—οὐ κναμευτὸν, ἀλλ' ἑλομένων Ἀθηναίων (Plutarch, Arist. c. 1).

Isokratês also (Areopagit. Or. vii. p. 144, p. 195, ed. Bekker) conceived the constitution of Kleisthenês as including all the three points noticed in the text:—1. A high pecuniary qualification of eligibility for individual offices. 2. Election to these offices by all the citizens, and accountability to the same after office. 3. No employment of the lot.—He even contends that this election is more truly democratical than sortition; since the latter process might admit men attached to oligarchy, which would not happen under the former—ἔπειτα καὶ δημοτικωτέραν ἐνόμιζον ταύτην τὴν κατάστασιν ἢ τὴν διὰ τοῦ λαγχάνειν γιγνομένην· ἐν μὲν γὰρ τῇ κληρώσει τὴν τύχην βραβεύσειν, καὶ πολλάκις λήψεσθαι τὰς ἀρχὰς τοὺς τῆς ὀλιγαρχίας ἐπιθυμοῦντας, &c. This would be a good argument if there were no pecuniary qualification for eligibility—such pecuniary qualification is a provision which he lays down, but which he does not find it convenient to insist upon emphatically.

I do not here advert to the γραφὴ παρανόμων, the νομοφύλακες, and the sworn νομοθέται—all of them institutions belonging to the time of Periklês at the earliest; not to that of Kleisthenês.

if they conceived him as polemarch at the head of the right wing of the army, or as an archon administering justice.

Senate of Areopagus.

A farther difference between the constitution of Solôn and that of Kleisthenês is to be found in the position of the senate of Areopagus. Under the former, that senate had been the principal body in the state, and Solôn had even enlarged its powers; under the latter, it must have been treated at first as an enemy and kept down. For as it was composed only of all the past archons, and as during the preceding thirty years every archon had been a creature of the Peisistratids, the Areopagites collectively must have been both hostile and odious to Kleisthenês and his partisans—perhaps a fraction of its members might even retire into exile with Hippias. Its influence must have been sensibly lessened by the change of party, until it came to be gradually filled by fresh archons springing from the bosom of the Kleisthenean constitution. Now during this important interval, the new-modelled senate of Five Hundred and the popular assembly stepped into that ascendency which they never afterwards lost. From the time of Kleisthenês forward, the Areopagites cease to be the chief and prominent power in the state. Yet they are still considerable; and when the second fill of the democratical tide took place, after the battle of Platæa, they became the focus of that which was then considered as the party of oligarchical resistance. I have already remarked that the archons during the intermediate time (about 509—477 B.C.) were all elected by the Ekklesia, not chosen by lot, and that the fourth or poorest and most numerous class on the census were by law then ineligible; while election at Athens, even when every citizen without exception was an elector and eligible, had a natural tendency to fall upon men of wealth and station. We thus see how it happened that the past archons, when united in the senate of Areopagus, infused into that body the sympathies, prejudices, and interests of the richer classes. It was this which brought them into conflict with the more democratical party headed by Periklês and Ephialtês, in times when portions of the Kleisthenean constitution had come to be discredited as too much imbued with oligarchy.

One other remarkable institution, distinctly ascribed to Kleisthenês, yet remains to be noticed—the ostracism; upon

which I have already made some remarks[1] in touching upon the memorable Solonian proclamation against neutrality in a sedition. It is hardly too much to say, that without this protective process none of the other institutions would have reached maturity. The ostracism.

By the ostracism a citizen was banished without special accusation, trial, or defence, for a term of ten years—subsequently diminished to five. His property was not taken away, nor his reputation tainted; so that the penalty consisted solely in the banishment from his native city to some other Greek city. As to reputation, the ostracism was a compliment rather than otherwise;[2] and so it was vividly felt to be, when, about ninety years after Kleisthenês, the conspiracy between Nikias and Alkibiadês fixed it upon Hyperbolus: the two former had both recommended the taking of an ostracising vote, each hoping to cause the banishment of the other; but before the day arrived, they accommodated their own quarrel. To fire off the safety-gun of the republic against a person so little dangerous as Hyperbolus, was denounced as the prostitution of a great political ceremony: "it was not against such men as him (said the comic writer Plato[3]) that the

[1] See above, chap. xi.

[2] Aristeidês Rhetor, Orat. xlvi. vol. ii. p. 317, ed. Dindorf.

[3] Plutarch (Nikias, c. 11; Alkibiad. c. 13; Aristeid. c. 7): Thucyd. viii. 73. Plato Comicus said respecting Hyperbolus—

Οὐ γὰρ τοιούτων οὕνεκ' ὄστρακ' ἠνρέθη.

Theophrastus had stated that Phæax, and not Nikias, was the rival of Alkibiadês on this occasion when Hyperbolus was ostracised: but most authors (says Plutarch) represent Nikias as the person. It is curious that there should be any difference of statement about a fact so notorious, and in the best-known time of Athenian history.

Taylor thinks that the oration which now passes as that of Andokidês against Alkibiadês, is really by Phæax, and was read by Plutarch, as the oration of Phæax in an actual contest of ostracism between Phæax, Nikias, and Alkibiadês. He is opposed by Ruhnken and Valckenaer (see Sluiter's preface to that oration, c. 1, and Ruhnken, Hist. Critic. Oratt. Græcor. p. 135). I cannot agree with either: I cannot think with him, that it is a real oration of Phæax; nor with them, that it is a real oration in any genuine cause of ostracism whatever. It appears to me to have been composed after the ostracism had fallen into desuetude, and when the Athenians had not only become somewhat ashamed of it, but had lost the familiar conception of what it really was. For how otherwise can we explain the fact, that the author of that oration complains that he is about to be ostracised without any secret voting, in which the very essence of the ostracism consisted, and from which its name was borrowed (οὔτε διαψηφισαμένων κρυβδήν, c. 2)? His oration is framed as if the audience whom he was addressing were about to ostracise one out of the three by show of hands. But the process of ostracising included no meeting and haranguing—nothing but simple deposit of the shells or sherds in a cask; as may be seen by the description of the special railing-in of the agora, and by the story (true or false) of the unlettered country-citizen coming in to the city to give his vote, and asking Aristeidês, without even

shell was intended to be used". The process of ostracism was carried into effect by writing upon a shell or potsherd the name of the person whom a citizen thought it prudent for a time to banish; which shell, when deposited in the proper vessel, counted for a vote towards the sentence.

Weakness of the public force in the Grecian governments.

I have already observed that all the governments of the Grecian cities, when we compare them with that idea which a modern reader is apt to conceive of the measure of force belonging to a government, were essentially weak —the good as well as the bad—the democratical, the oligarchical, and the despotic. The force in the hands of any government, to cope with conspirators or mutineers, was extremely small, with the single exception of a despot surrounded with his mercenary troop. Accordingly, no tolerably sustained conspiracy or usurper could be put down except by direct aid of the people in support of the government; which amounted to a dissolution, for the time, of constitutional authority, and was pregnant with reactionary consequences such as no man could foresee. To prevent powerful men from attempting usurpation was therefore of the greatest possible moment. Now a despot or an oligarchy might exercise at pleasure preventive means,[1] much sharper than the ostracism, such as the assassination of Kimôn, mentioned in my last chapter as directed by the Peisistratids. At the very least, they might send away any one, from whom they apprehended attack or danger, without incurring even so much as the imputation of severity. But in a democracy, where arbitrary action of the

knowing his person, to write the name for him on the shell (Plutarch, Aristeid. c. 7). There was indeed previous discussion in the senate as well as in the ekklesia, whether a vote of ostracism should be entered upon at all; but the author of the oration to which I allude does not address himself to *that* question; he assumes that the vote is actually about to be taken, and that one of the three—himself, Nikias, or Alkibiadês—must be ostracised (c. 1). Now, doubtless, in practice the decision commonly lay between two formidable rivals; but it was not publicly or formally put so before the people: every citizen might write upon the shell such name as he chose. Farther, the open denunciation of the injustice of ostracism as a system (c. 2), proves an age later than the banishment of Hyperbolus. Moreover, the author, having begun by remarking that he stands in contest with Nikias as well as with Alkibiadês, says nothing more about Nikias to the end of the speech.

[1] See the discussion of the ostracism in Aristot. Politic. iii. 8, where he recognises the problem as one common to all governments.

Compare also a good Dissertation — J. A. Paradys, De Ostracismo Atheniensium, Lugduni Batavor. 1792; K. F. Hermann, Lehrbuch der Griechischen Staatsalterthümer, ch. 130; and Schömann, Antiq. Jur. Pub. Græc. ch. xxxv p. 233.

magistrate was the thing of all others most dreaded, and where fixed laws, with trial and defence as preliminaries to punishment, were conceived by the ordinary citizen as the guarantees of his personal security and as the pride of his social condition—the creation of such an exceptional power presented serious difficulty. If we transport ourselves to the times of Kleisthenês, immediately after the expulsion of the Peisistratids, when the working of the democratical machinery was as yet untried, we shall find this difficulty at its maximum. But we shall also find the necessity of vesting such a power somewhere absolutely imperative. For the great Athenian nobles had yet to learn the lesson of respect for any constitution. Their past history had exhibited continual struggles between the armed factions of Megaklês, Lykurgus, and Peisistratus, put down after a time by the superior force and alliances of the latter; and though Kleisthenês, the son of Megaklês, might be firmly disposed to renounce the example of his father and to act as the faithful citizen of a fixed constitution, he would know but too well that the sons of his father's companions and rivals would follow out ambitious purposes without any regard to the limits imposed by law, if ever they acquired sufficient partisans to present a fair prospect of success. Moreover, when any two candidates for power, with such reckless dispositions, came into a bitter personal rivalry, the motives to each of them, arising as well out of fear as out of ambition, to put down his opponent at any cost to the constitution, might well become irresistible, unless some impartial and discerning interference could arrest the strife in time. "If the Athenians were wise (Aristeidês is reported to have said,[1] in the height and peril of his parliamentary struggle with Themistoklês), they would cast both Themistoklês and me into the barathrum."[2] And whoever reads the sad narrative of the Korkyræan sedition, in the third book of Thucydidês, together with the reflections of the historian upon

Past violences of the Athenian nobles.

[1] Plutarch, Aristeid. c. 8.

[2] The barathrum was a deep pit, said to have had iron spikes at the bottom, into which criminals condemned to death were sometimes cast. Though probably an ancient Athenian punishment, it seems to have become at the very least extremely rare, if not entirely disused, during the times of Athens historically known to us; but the phrase continued in speech after the practice had become obsolete. The iron spikes depend on the evidence of the Schol. Aristophan. Plutus, 431—a very doubtful authority, when we read the legend which he blends with his statement.

it,[1] will trace the gradual exasperation of these party feuds, beginning even under democratical forms, until at length they break down the barriers of public as well as of private morality.

Against this chance of internal assailants Kleisthenês had to protect the democratical constitution—first, by throwing impediments in their way and rendering it difficult for them to procure the requisite support; next, by eliminating them before any violent projects were ripe for execution. To do either the one or the other, it was necessary to provide such a constitution as would not only conciliate the good-will, but kindle the passionate attachment, of the mass of citizens, insomuch that not even any considerable minority should be deliberately inclined to alter it by force. It was necessary to create in the multitude, and through them to force upon the leading ambitious men, that rare and difficult sentiment which we may term a constitutional morality—a paramount reverence for the forms of the constitution, enforcing obedience to the authorities acting under and within those forms, yet combined with the habit of open speech, of action subject only to definite legal control, and unrestrained censure of those very authorities as to all their public acts—combined, too, with a perfect confidence in the bosom of every citizen, amidst the bitterness of party contest, that the forms of the constitution will be not less sacred in the eyes of his opponents than in his own. This co-existence of freedom and self-imposed restraint—of obedience to authority with unmeasured censure of the persons exercising it—may be found in the aristocracy of England (since about 1688) as well as in the democracy of the American United States: and because we are familiar with it, we are apt to suppose it a natural sentiment; though there seem to be few sentiments more difficult to establish and diffuse among a community, judging by the experience of history. We may see how imperfectly it exists at this day in the Swiss Cantons; while the many violences of the first French Revolution illustrate, among various other lessons, the fatal effects arising from its absence, even among a people high in the scale of intelligence. Yet the diffusion of such constitutional morality, not merely among the majority of any community, but through-

Necessity of creating a constitutional morality.

[1] Thucyd. iii. 70, 81, 82.

out the whole, is the indispensable condition of a government at once free and peaceable; since even any powerful and obstinate minority may render the working of free institutions impracticable, without being strong enough to conquer ascendency for themselves. Nothing less than unanimity, or so overwhelming a majority as to be tantamount to unanimity, on the cardinal point of respecting constitutional forms, even by those who do not wholly approve of them, can render the excitement of political passion bloodless, and yet expose all the authorities in the state to the full licence of pacific criticism.

Purpose and working of the ostracism.

At the epoch of Kleisthenês, which, by a remarkable coincidence, is the same as that of the regifuge at Rome, such constitutional morality, if it existed anywhere else, had certainly no place at Athens; and the first creation of it in any particular society must be esteemed an interesting historical fact. By the spirit of his reforms,—equal, popular, and comprehensive, far beyond the previous experience of Athenians—he secured the hearty attachment of the body of citizens. But from the first generation of leading men, under the nascent democracy, and with such precedents as they had to look back upon, no self-imposed limits to ambition could be expected. Accordingly, Kleisthenês had to find the means of eliminating beforehand any one about to transgress these limits, so as to escape the necessity of putting him down afterwards, with all that bloodshed and reaction, in the midst of which the free working of the constitution would be suspended at least, if not irrevocably extinguished. To acquire such influence as would render him dangerous under democratical forms, a man must stand in evidence before the public, so as to afford some reasonable means of judging of his character and purposes. Now the security which Kleisthenês provided was to call in the positive judgment of the citizens respecting his future promise purely and simply, so that they might not remain too long neutral between two formidable political rivals—pursuant in a certain way to the Solonian proclamation against neutrality in a sedition, as I have already remarked in a former chapter. He incorporated in the constitution itself the principle of *privilegium* (to employ the Roman phrase, which signifies, not a peculiar favour granted to any one, but a peculiar inconvenience imposed), yet only under

circumstances solemn and well-defined, with full notice and discussion beforehand, and by the positive secret vote of a large proportion of the citizens. "No law shall be made against any single citizen, without the same being made against *all* Athenian citizens; unless it shall so seem good to 6000 citizens voting secretly."[1] Such was that general principle of the constitution, under which the ostracism was a particular case. Before the vote of ostracism could be taken, a case was to be made out in the senate and the public assembly to justify it. In the sixth prytany of the year, these two bodies debated and determined whether the state of the republic was menacing enough to call for such an exceptional measure.[2] If they decided in the affirmative, a day was named, the agora was railed round, with ten entrances left for the citizens of each tribe, and ten separate casks or vessels for depositing the suffrages, which consisted of a shell or a potsherd with the name of the person written on it whom each citizen designed to banish. At the end of the day the number of votes were summed up, and if 6000 votes were found to have been given against any one person, that person was ostracised; if not, the ceremony ended in nothing.[3] Ten days were allowed to him

[1] Andokidês, De Mysteriis, p. 12, c. 13. Μηδὲ νόμον ἐπ' ἀνδρὶ ἐξεῖναι θεῖναι, ἐὰν μὴ τὸν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσιν Ἀθηναίοις· ἐὰν μὴ ἑξακισχιλίοις δόξῃ, κρυβδὴν ψηφιζομένοις. According to the usual looseness in dealing with the name of Solôn, this has been called a law of Solôn (see Petit. Leg. Att. p. 188), though it certainly cannot be older than Kleisthenês.

"Privilegia ne irroganto," said the law of the Twelve Tables at Rome (Cicero, Legg. iii. 4—19).

[2] Aristotle and Philochorus, ap. Photium, App. p. 672 and 675, ed. Porson.

It would rather appear by that passage that the ostracism was never formally abrogated; and that even in the later times, to which the description of Aristotle refers, the form was still preserved of putting the question whether the public safety called for an ostracising vote, long after it had passed both out of use and out of mind.

[3] Philochorus, *ut supra*; Plutarch, Aristeid. c. 7; Schol. ad Aristophan. Equit. 851: Pollux, viii. 19.

There is a difference of opinion among the authorities, as well as among the expositors, whether the minimum of 6000 applies to the votes given in all, or to the votes given against any one name. I embrace the latter opinion, which is supported by Philochorus, Pollux, and the Schol. on Aristophanês, though Plutarch countenances the former. Boeckh, in his Public Economy of Athens, and Wachsmuth (i. 1, p. 272) are in favour of Plutarch and the former opinion: Paradys (Dissertat. De Ostr. p. 25), Platner, and Hermann (see K. F. Hermann, Lehrbuch der Gr. Staatsalt. ch. 130, not. 6) support the other, which appears to me the right one.

For the purpose, so unequivocally pronounced, of the general law determining the absolute minimum necessary for *a privilegium*, would by no means be obtained, if the simple majority of votes, among 6000 voters in all, had been allowed to take effect. A person might then be ostracised with a very small number of votes against him, and without creating any reasonable presumption that he was dangerous to the constitution; which was by no means either the purpose of Kleisthenês, or the well-understood opera-

for settling his affairs, after which he was required to depart from Attica for ten years, but retained his property, and suffered no other penalty.

Securities against its abuse.

It was not the maxim at Athens to escape the errors of the people, by calling in the different errors, and the sinister interest besides, of an extrapopular or privileged few. Nor was any third course open, since the principles of representative government were not understood, nor indeed conveniently applicable to very small communities. Beyond the judgment of the people (so the Athenians felt) there was no appeal. Their grand study was to surround the delivery of that judgment with the best securities for rectitude, and the best preservatives against haste, passion, or private corruption. Whatever measure of good government could not be obtained in that way, could not, in their opinion, be obtained at all. I shall illustrate the Athenian proceedings on this head more fully when I come to speak of the working of their mature democracy. Meanwhile in respect to this grand protection of the nascent democracy—the vote of ostracism—it will be found that the securities devised by Kleisthenês, for making the sentence effectual against the really dangerous man and against no one else, display not less foresight than patriotism. The main object was to render the voting an expression of deliberate public feeling, as distinguished from mere factious antipathy. Now the large minimum of votes required (one-fourth of the entire citizen population) went far to ensure this effect—the more so, since each vote, taken as it was in a secret manner, counted unequivocally for the expression of a genuine and independent sentiment, and could neither be coerced nor bought. Then again, Kleisthenês did not permit the process of ostracising to be opened against any one citizen exclusively. If opened at all, every one without exception was exposed to the sentence; so that the friends of Themistoklês could not invoke it against Aristeidês,[1] nor those of the latter against the former, without exposing their own leader

tion of the ostracism, so long as it continued to be a reality.

[1] The practical working of the ostracism presents it as a struggle between two contending leaders, accompanied with chance of banishment to both—Periklês *πρὸς τὸν Θουκυδίδην εἰς ἀγῶνα περὶ τοῦ ὀστράκου καταστὰς, καὶ διακινδυνεύσας, ἐκείνου μὲν ἐξέβαλε, κατέλυσε δὲ τὴν ἀντιτεταγμένην ἑταιρείαν* (Plutarch, Periklês, c. 14: compare Plutarch, Nikias, c. 11).

to the same chance of exile. It was not likely to be invoked at all, therefore, until exasperation had proceeded so far as to render both parties insensible to this chance—the precise index of that growing internecine hostility, which the ostracism prevented from coming to a head. Nor could it even then be ratified, unless a case was shown to convince the more neutral portion of the senate and the ekklesia; moreover, after all, the ekklesia did not itself ostracise, but a future day was named, and the whole body of the citizens were solemnly invited to vote. It was in this way that security was taken not only for making the ostracism effectual in protecting the constitution, but to hinder it from being employed for any other purpose. We must recollect that it exercised its tutelary influence not merely on those occasions when it was actually employed, but by the mere knowledge that it might be employed, and by the restraining effect which that knowledge produced on the conduct of the great men. Again, the ostracism, though essentially of an exceptional nature, was yet an exception sanctified and limited by the constitution itself; so that the citizen, in giving his ostracising vote, did not in any way depart from the constitution or lose his reverence for it. The issue placed before him,—"Is there any man whom you think vitally dangerous to the state? if so, whom?"—though vague, was yet raised directly and legally. Had there been no ostracism, it might probably have been raised both indirectly and illegally, on the occasion of some special imputed crime of a suspected political leader, when accused before a court of justice—a perversion involving all the mischief of the ostracism, without its protective benefits.

Care was taken to divest the ostracism of all painful consequence except what was inseparable from exile. This is not one of the least proofs of the wisdom with which it was devised. Most certainly it never deprived the public of candidates for political influence: and when we consider the small amount of individual evil which it inflicted—evil too diminished, in the cases of Kimôn and Aristeidês, by a reactionary sentiment which augmented their subsequent popularity after return—two remarks will be quite sufficient to offer in the way of justification. First, it completely produced its intended effect; for the

Ostracism necessary as a protection to the early democracy—afterwards dispensed with.

democracy grew up from infancy to manhood without a single attempt to overthrow it by force[1]—a result upon which no reflecting contemporary of Kleisthenês could have ventured to calculate. Next, through such tranquil working of the democratical forms, a constitutional morality quite sufficiently complete was produced among the leading Athenians, to enable the people after a certain time to dispense with that exceptional security which the ostracism offered.[2] To the nascent democracy it was absolutely indispensable: to the growing, yet militant, democracy it was salutary; but the full-grown democracy both could and did stand without it. The ostracism passed upon Hyperbolus, about ninety years after Kleisthenês, was the last occasion of its employment. And even this can hardly be considered as a serious instance: it was a trick concerted between two distinguished Athenians (Nikias and Alkibiadês) to turn to their own political account a process already coming to be antiquated. Nor would such a manœuvre have been possible, if the contemporary Athenian citizens had been penetrated with the same serious feeling of the value of ostracism as a safeguard of democracy, as had been once entertained by their fathers and grandfathers. Between Kleisthenês and Hyperbolus, we hear of about ten different persons as having been banished by ostracism: first of all, Hipparchus of the deme Cholargus, the son of Charmus, a relative of the recently-expelled Peisistratid despots;[3] then Aristeidês, Themistoklês, Kimôn, and Thucydidês son of Melêsias,

[1] It is not necessary in this remark to take notice, either of the oligarchy of Four Hundred, or of that of Thirty, called the Thirty Tyrants, established during the closing years of the Peloponnesian war, and after the ostracism had been discontinued. Neither of these changes were brought about by the excessive ascendency of any one or few men: both of them grew out of the embarrassments and dangers of Athens in the latter period of her great foreign war.

[2] Aristotle (Polit. iii. 8, 6) seems to recognise the political necessity of the ostracism, as applied even to obvious superiority of wealth, connexion, &c. (which he distinguishes pointedly from superiority of merit and character), and upon principles of symmetry only, even apart from dangerous designs on the part of the superior mind. No painter (he observes) will permit a foot, in his picture of a man, to be of disproportionate size with the entire body, though separately taken it may be finely painted; nor will the chorusmaster allow any one voice, however beautiful, to predominate beyond a certain proportion over the rest.

His final conclusion is, however, that the legislator ought, if possible, so to construct his constitution, as to have no need of such exceptional remedy; but if this cannot be done, then the second-best step is to apply the ostracism. Compare also v. 2, 5.

The last century of the free Athenian democracy realised the first of these alternatives.

[3] Plutarch, Nikias, c. 11; Harpokration, v. Ἱππαρχος.

all of them renowned political leaders: also Alkibiadês and Megaklês (the paternal and maternal grandfathers of the distinguished Alkibiadês), and Kallias, belonging to another eminent family at Athens;[1] lastly, Damôn, the preceptor of Periklês in poetry and music, and eminent for his acquisitions in philosophy.[2] In this last case comes out the vulgar side of humanity, aristocratical as well as democratical; for with both, the process of philosophy and the persons of philosophers are wont to be alike unpopular. Even Kleisthenês himself is said to have been ostracised under his own law, and Xanthippus; but both upon authority too weak to trust.[3] Miltiadês was not ostracised at all, but tried and punished for misconduct in his command.

Ostracism analogous to the exclusion of a known pretender to the throne in a monarchy.

I should hardly have said so much about this memorable and peculiar institution of Kleisthenês, if the erroneous accusations, against the Athenian democracy, of envy, injustice, and ill-treatment of their superior men, had not been greatly founded upon it, and if such criticisms had not passed from ancient times to modern with little examination. In monarchical governments, a pretender to the throne, numbering a certain amount of supporters, is as a matter of course excluded from the country. The duke of Bordeaux cannot now reside in France—nor could Napoleon after 1815—nor Charles Edward in England during the last century. No man treats this as any extravagant injustice, yet it is the parallel of the ostracism—with a stronger case in favour of the latter, inasmuch as the change from one regal dynasty to another does not of necessity overthrow all the collateral institutions and securities of the country. Plutarch has affirmed that the ostracism arose from the envy and jealousy inherent in a democracy,[4] and not from justifiable fears—an observation often repeated, yet not the less demonstrably untrue. Not merely because ostracism so worked as often to increase the influence of

[1] Lysias cont. Alkibiad. A. c. 11, p. 143; Harpokratiôn, v. Ἀλκιβιάδης· Andokidês cont. Alkibiad. c. 11, 12. p. 129, 130: this last oration may afford evidence as to the facts mentioned in it, though I cannot imagine it to be either genuine or belonging to the time to which it professes to refer, as has been observed in a previous note.

[2] Plutarch, Periklês, c. 4; Plutarch, Aristeid. c. 1.

[3] Ælian, V. H. xiii. 24; Herakleidês, περὶ Πολιτειῶν, c. 1, ed. Köhler.

[4] Plutarch, Themistoklês, 22: Plutarch, Aristeidês, 7, παραμυθία φθόνου καὶ κουφισμός. See the same opinions repeated by Wachsmuth, Hellenische Alterthumskunde, ch. 48, vol. i. p. 272, and by Platner, Prozess und Klagen bey den Attikern, vol. i. p. 386.

that political leader whose rival it removed, but still more, because, if the fact had been as Plutarch says, this institution would have continued as long as the democracy; whereas it finished with the banishment of Hyperbolus, at a period when the government was more decisively democratical than it had been in the time of Kleisthenês. It was, in truth, a product altogether of fear and insecurity,[1] on the part both of the democracy and its best friends—fear perfectly well grounded, and only appearing needless because the precautions taken prevented attack. So soon as the diffusion of a constitutional morality had placed the mass of the citizens above all serious fear of an aggressive usurper, the ostracism was discontinued. And doubtless the feeling, that it might safely be dispensed with, must have been strengthened by the long ascendency of Periklês—by the spectacle of the greatest statesman whom Athens ever produced, acting steadily within the limits of the constitution; and by the ill-success of his two opponents, Kimôn and Thucydidês—aided by numerous partisans and by the great comic writers, at a period when comedy was a power in the state such as it has never been before or since—in their attempts to get him ostracised. They succeeded in fanning up the ordinary antipathy of the citizens towards philosophers so far as to procure the ostracism of his friend and teacher Damôn; but Periklês himself (to repeat the complaint of his bitter enemy the comic poet Kratinus[2]) "holds his head as high as if he carried the Odeion upon it, now that the shell has gone by"—*i.e.* now that he has escaped the ostracism. If Periklês was not conceived to be dangerous to the constitution, none of his successors were at all likely to be so regarded. Damôn and Hyperbolus were the two last persons ostracised. Both of them were cases, and the only cases, of an unequivocal abuse of the institution, because, whatever the grounds of displeasure against them may have been, it is impossible to conceive either of them as menacing to the state; whereas all the other known sufferers were men of such position and power, that the 6000

Effect of the long ascendency of Periklês in strengthening constitutional morality.

[1] Thucyd. viii. 73. *διὰ δυνάμεως καὶ ἀξιώματος φόβον.*

[2] Kratinus ap. Plutarch. Periklês, c. 13.

Ὁ σχινοκέφαλος Ζεὺς ὁδὶ προσέρχεται Περικλέης, τῷδεῖον ἐπὶ τοῦ κρανίου Ἔχων, ἐπειδὴ τοὔστρακον παροίχεται.

For the attacks of the comic writers upon Damôn, see Plutarch, Periklês, c. 4.

citizens who inscribed each name on the shell, or at least a large proportion of them, may well have done so under the most conscientious belief that they were guarding the constitution against real danger. Such a change in the character of the persons ostracised plainly evinces that the ostracism had become dissevered from that genuine patriotic prudence which originally rendered it both legitimate and popular. It had served for two generations an inestimable tutelary purpose—it lived to be twice dishonoured—and then passed, by universal acquiescence, into matter of history.

Ostracism in other Grecian cities.

A process analogous to the ostracism subsisted at Argos,[1] at Syracuse, and in some other Grecian democracies. Aristotle states that it was abused for factious purposes: and at Syracuse, where it was introduced after the expulsion of the Gelonian dynasty, Diodôrus affirms that it was so unjustly and profusely applied, as to deter persons of wealth and station from taking any part in public affairs; for which reason it was speedily discontinued. We have no particulars to enable us to appreciate this general statement. But we cannot safely infer that because the ostracism worked on the whole well at Athens, it must necessarily have worked well in other states—the more so as we do not know whether it was surrounded with the same precautionary formalities, nor whether it even required the same large minimum of votes to make it effective. This latter guarantee, so valuable in regard to an institution essentially easy to abuse, is not noticed by Diodôrus in his brief account of the Petalism — so the process was denominated at Syracuse.[2]

Striking effect of the revolution of Kleisthenês on the minds of the citizens.

Such was the first Athenian democracy, engendered as well by the reaction against Hippias and his dynasty, as by the memorable partnership, whether spontaneous or compulsory, between Kleisthenês and the unfranchised multitude. It is to be distinguished both from the mitigated oligarchy established by Solôn before, and from the full-grown and symmetrical democracy which prevailed afterwards from the beginning of the Peloponnesian

1 Aristot. Polit. iii. 8, 4; v. 2, 5.

2 Diodôr. xi. 55–87. This author describes very imperfectly the Athenian ostracism, transferring to it apparently the circumstances of the Syracusan Petalism.

war, towards the close of the career of Periklês. It was indeed a striking revolution, impressed upon the citizen not less by the sentiments to which it appealed than by the visible change which it made in political and social life. He saw himself marshalled in the ranks of hoplites alongside of new companions in arms—he was enrolled in a new register, and his property in a new schedule, in his deme and by his demarch, an officer before unknown—he found the year distributed afresh, for all legal purposes, into ten parts bearing the name of prytanies, each marked by a solemn and free-spoken ekklesia at which he had a right to be present—his ekklesia was convoked and presided by senators called prytanes, members of a senate novel both as to number and distribution—his political duties were now performed as member of a tribe, designated by a name not before pronounced in common Attic life, connected with one of ten heroes whose statues he now for the first time saw in the agora, and associating him with fellow-tribemen from all parts of Attica. All these and many others were sensible novelties felt in the daily proceedings of the citizen. But the great novelty of all was the authentic recognition of the ten new tribes as a sovereign Dêmos or people, apart from all specialties of Phratric or gentile origin, with free speech and equal law; retaining no distinction except the four classes of the Solonian property-schedule with their gradations of eligibility. To a considerable proportion of citizens this great novelty was still farther endeared by the fact that it had raised them out of the degraded position of metics and slaves; while to the large majority of all the citizens it furnished a splendid political idea, profoundly impressive to the Greek mind—capable of calling forth the most ardent attachment as well as the most devoted sense of active obligation and obedience. We have now to see how their newly-created patriotism manifested itself.

Kleisthenês and his new constitution carried with them so completely the popular favour, that Isagoras had no other way of opposing it except by calling in the interference of Kleomenês and the Lacedæmonians. Kleomenês listened the more readily to this call, as he was reported to have been on an intimate footing with the wife of Isagoras. He prepared to come to Athens; but his

*Isagoras calls in Kleomenês and the Lacedæmonians against it.*

first aim was to deprive the democracy of its great leader Kleisthenês, who, as belonging to the Alkmæônid family, was supposed to be tainted with the inherited sin of his great-grandfather Megaklês, the destroyer of the usurper Kylôn. Kleomenês sent a herald to Athens, demanding the expulsion "of the accursed"—so this family were called by their enemies, and so they continued to be called eighty years afterwards, when the same manœuvre was practised by the Lacedæmonians of that day against Periklês. This requisition, recommended by Isagoras, was so well-timed, that Kleisthenês, not venturing to disobey it, retired voluntarily; so that Kleomenês, though arriving at Athens only with a small force, found himself master of the city. At the instigation of Isagoras, he sent into exile seven hundred families, selected from the chief partisans of Kleisthenês. His next attempt was to dissolve the new senate of Five Hundred, and to place the whole government in the hands of three hundred adherents of the chief whose cause he espoused. But now was seen the spirit infused into the people by their new constitution. At the time of the first usurpation of Peisistratus, the senate of that day had not only not resisted, but even lent themselves to the scheme. Now, the new senate of Kleisthenês resolutely refused to submit to dissolution, while the citizens generally, even after the banishment of the chief Kleisthenean partisans, manifested their feelings in a way at once so hostile and so determined, that Kleomenês and Isagoras were altogether baffled. They were compelled to retire into the acropolis and stand upon the defensive. This symptom of weakness was the signal for a general rising of the Athenians, who besieged the Spartan king on the holy rock. He had evidently come without any expectation of finding, or any means of overpowering, resistance; for at the end of two days his provisions were exhausted, and he was forced to capitulate. He and his Lacedæmonians, as well as Isagoras, were allowed to retire to Sparta; but the Athenians of the party captured along with him were imprisoned, condemned,[1] and executed by the people.

Kleomenês and Isagoras expelled from Athens.

Kleisthenês, with the seven hundred exiled families, was immediately recalled, and his new constitution materially

1 Herodot. v. 70—72: compare Schol. ad Aristophan. Lysistr. 274.

strengthened by this first success. Yet the prospect of renewed Spartan attack was sufficiently serious to induce him to send envoys to Artaphernês, the Persian Satrap at Sardis, soliciting the admission of Athens into the Persian alliance. He probably feared the intrigues of the expelled Hippias in the same quarter. Artaphernês, having first informed himself who the Athenians were, and where they dwelt, replied that if they chose to send earth and water to the king of Persia, they might be received as allies, but upon no other condition. Such were the feelings of alarm under which the envoys had quitted Athens, that they went the length of promising this unqualified token of submission. But their countrymen on their return disavowed them with scorn and indignation.[1]

Recal of Kleisthenês—Athens solicits the alliance of the Persians.

It was at this time that the first connexion began between Athens and the little Bœotian town of Platæa, situated on the northern slope of the range of Kithærôn, between that mountain and the river Asôpus—on the road from Athens to Thêbes; and it is upon this occasion that we first become acquainted with the Bœotians and their polities. In one of my preceding volumes,[2] the Bœotian federation has already been briefly described, as composed of some twelve or thirteen autonomous towns under the headship of Thêbes, which was, or professed to have been, their mother-city. Platæa had been (so the Thebans affirmed) their latest foundation;[3] it was ill-used by them, and discontented with the alliance. Accordingly, as Kleomenês was on his way back from Athens, the Platæans took the opportunity of addressing themselves to him, craving the protection of Sparta against Thêbes, and surrendering their town and territory without reserve. The Spartan king, having no motive to undertake a trust which promised nothing but trouble, advised them to solicit the protection of Athens, as nearer and more accessible for them in case of need. He foresaw that this would embroil the Athenians with Bœotia, and such anticipation was in fact his chief motive for giving the advice, which the Platæans followed. Selecting an occasion of public sacrifice at Athens, they des-

First connexion between Athens and Platæa.

1 Herodot. v. 73. 2 See part ii. ch. 3. 3 Thucyd. iii. 61.

patched thither envoys, who sat down as suppliants at the altar, surrendered their town to Athens, and implored protection against Thêbes. Such an appeal was not to be resisted, and protection was promised. It was soon needed, for the Thebans invaded the Platæan territory, and an Athenian force marched to defend it. Battle was about to be joined, when the Corinthians interposed with their mediation, which was accepted by both parties. They decided altogether in favour of Platæa, pronouncing that the Thebans had no right to employ force against any seceding member of the Bœotian federation.[1] The Thebans, finding the decision against them, refused to abide by it, and attacked the Athenians on their return, but sustained a complete defeat: a breach of faith which the Athenians avenged by joining to Platæa the portion of Theban territory south of the Asôpus, and making that river the limit between the two. By such success, however, the Athenians gained nothing, except the enmity of Bœotia—as Kleomenês had foreseen. Their alliance with Platæa, long continued, and presenting in the course of this history several incidents touching to our sympathies, will be found, if we except one splendid occasion,[2] productive only of burden to the one party, yet insufficient as a protection to the other.

*Disputes between Platæa and Thêbes—decision of Corinth.*

[1] Herodot. vi. 108. ἐᾶν Θηβαίους Βοιωτῶν τοὺς μὴ βουλομένους ἐς Βοιωτοὺς τελέειν. This is an important circumstance, in regard to Grecian political feeling: I shall advert to it hereafter.

[2] Herodot. vi. 108. Thucydidês (iii. 68). when recounting the capture of Platæa by the Lacedæmonians in the third year of the Peloponnesian war, states that the alliance between Platæa and Athens was then in its 93rd year of date; according to which reckoning it would begin in the year 519 B.C., where Mr. Clinton and other chronologers place it.

I venture to think that the immediate circumstances, as recounted in the text from Herodotus (whether Thucydidês conceived them in the same way, cannot be determined), which brought about the junction of Platæa with Athens, cannot have taken place in 519 B.C., but must have happened *after* the expulsion of Hippias from Athens in 510 B.C.—for the following reasons:—

1. No mention is made of Hippias; who yet, if the event had happened in 519 B.C., must have been the person to determine whether the Athenians should assist Platæa or not. The Platæan envoys present themselves at a public sacrifice in the attitude of suppliants, so as to touch the feelings of the Athenian citizens generally: had Hippias been then despot, *he* would have been the person to be propitiated and to determine for or against assistance.

2. We know no cause which should have brought. Kleomenês with a Lacedæmonian force near to Platæa in the year 519 B.C.: we know from the statement of Herodotus (v. 76) that no Lacedæmonian expedition against Attica took place at that time. But in the year to which I have referred the event, Kleomenês is on his march near the spot upon a known and assignable object. From the very tenor of the narrative, it is plain that Kleomenês and his army were not designedly in Bœotia, nor meddling.

Meanwhile Kleomenês had returned to Sparta full of resentment against the Athenians, and resolved on punishing them as well as on establishing his friend Isagoras as despot over them. Having been taught, however, by humiliating experience, that this was no easy achievement, he would not make the attempt, without having assembled a considerable force. He summoned allies from all the various states of Peloponnêsus, yet without venturing to inform them what he was about to undertake. He at the same time concerted measures with the Bœotians, and with the Chalkidians of Eubœa, for a simultaneous invasion of Attica on all sides. It appears that he had greater confidence in their hostile dispositions towards Athens than in those of the Peloponnesians, for he was not afraid to acquaint them with his

Second march of Kleomenês against Athens—desertion of his allies.

with Bœotian affairs, at the time when the Platæans solicited his aid; for he declines to interpose in the matter, pleading the great distance between Sparta and Platæa as a reason.

3. Again, Kleomenês, in advising the Platæans to solicit Athens, does not give the advice through goodwill towards them, but through a desire to harass and perplex the Athenians, by entangling them in a quarrel with the Bœotians. At the point of time to which I have referred the incident, this was a very natural desire: he was angry, and perhaps alarmed, at the recent events which had brought about his expulsion from Athens. But what was there to make him conceive such a feeling against Athens during the reign of Hippias? That despot was on terms of the closest intimacy with Sparta: the Peisistratids were (*ξείνους —ξεινίους ταμάλιστα*—Herod. v. 63, 90, 91) "the particular guests" of the Spartans, who were only induced to take part against Hippias from a reluctant obedience to the oracles procured one after another by Kleisthenês. The motive therefore assigned by Herodotus, for the advice given by Kleomenês to the Platæans, can have no application to the time when Hippias was still despot.

4. That Herodotus did not conceive the victory gained by the Athenians over Thêbes as having taken place *before* the expulsion of Hippias, is evident from his emphatic contrast between their warlike spirit and success when liberated from the despots, and their timidity or backwardness while under Hippias (*Ἀθηναῖοι τυραννευόμενοι μὲν, οὐδαμῶν τῶν σφέας περιοικεόντων ἔσαν τὰ πολέμια ἀμείνονς, ἀπαλλαχθέντες δὲ τυράννων, μακρῷ πρῶτοι ἐγένοντο· δηλοῖ ὦν ταῦτα, ὅτι κατεχόμενοι μὲν, ἐθελοκάκεον*, &c. v. 78). The man who wrote thus cannot have believed that in the year 519 B.C., while Hippias was in full sway, the Athenians gained an important victory over the Thebans, cut off a considerable portion of the Theban territory for the purpose of joining it to that of the Platæans, and showed from that time forward their constant superiority over Thêbes by protecting her inferior neighbour against her.

These different reasons, taking them altogether, appear to me to show that the first alliance between Athens and Platæa, as Herodotus conceives and describes it, cannot have taken place before the expulsion of Hippias, in 510 B.C.; and induce me to believe either that Thucydidês was mistaken in the date of that event, or that Herodotus has not correctly described the facts. Not seeing any reason to suspect the description given by the latter, I have departed, though unwillingly, from the date of Thucydidês.

The application of the Platæans to Kleomenês, and his advice grounded thereupon, may be connected more suitably with his first expedition to Athens after the expulsion of Hippias, than with his second.

design—and probably the Bœotians were incensed with the recent interference of Athens in the affair of Platæa. As soon as these preparations were completed, the two kings of Sparta, Kleomenês and Demaratus, put themselves at the head of the united Peloponnesian force, marched into Attica, and advanced as far as Eleusis on the way to Athens. But when the allies came to know the purpose for which they were to be employed, a spirit of dissatisfaction manifested itself among them. They had no unfriendly sentiment towards Athens; and the Corinthians especially, favourably disposed rather than otherwise towards that city, resolved to proceed no farther, withdrew their contingent from the camp, and returned home. At the same time, king Demaratus, either sharing in the general dissatisfaction or moved by some grudge against his colleague which had not before manifested itself, renounced the undertaking also. Two such examples, operating upon the pre-existing sentiment of the allies generally, caused the whole camp to break up and return home without striking a blow.[1]

First appearance of Sparta as acting head of Peloponnesian allies.

We may here remark that this is the first instance known in which Sparta appears in act as recognised head of an obligatory Peloponnesian alliance,[2] summoning contingents from the cities to be placed under the command of her king. Her headship, previously recognised in theory, passes now into act, but in an unsatisfactory manner, so as to prove the necessity of precaution and concert beforehand—which will be found not long wanting.

Signal successes of Athens against Bœotians and Chalkidians.

Pursuant to the scheme concerted, the Bœotians and Chalkidians attacked Attica at the same time that Kleomenês entered it. The former seized Œnoê and Hysiæ, the frontier demes of Attica on the side towards Platæa; while the latter assailed the north-eastern frontier which faces Eubœa. Invaded on three sides, the Athenians were in serious danger, and were compelled to concentrate all their forces at Eleusis against Kleomenês, leaving the Bœotians and Chalkidians unopposed. But the unexpected breaking-up of the invading army from Peloponnêsus proved

[1] Herodot. v. 75.

[2] Compare Kortüm, Zur Geschichte Hellenischer Staatsverfassungen, p. 35 (Heidelberg, 1821).

I doubt, however, his interpretation of the words in Herodotus (v. 63)—εἴτε ἰδίῳ στόλῳ, εἴτε δημοσίῳ χρησόμενοι.

their rescue, and enabled them to turn the whole of their attention to the other frontier. They marched into Bœotia to the strait called Euripus which separates it from Eubœa, intending to prevent the junction of the Bœotians and Chalkidians, and to attack the latter first apart. But the arrival of the Bœotians caused an alteration in their scheme; they attacked the Bœotians first, and gained a victory of the most complete character—killing a large number, and capturing 700 prisoners. On the very same day they crossed over to Eubœa, attacked the Chalkidians, and gained another victory so decisive that it at once terminated the war. Many Chalkidians were taken, as well as Bœotians, and conveyed in chains to Athens, where after a certain detention they were at last ransomed for two minæ per man. Of the sum thus raised, a tenth was employed in the fabrication of a chariot and four horses in bronze, which was placed in the acropolis to commemorate the victory. Herodotus saw this trophy when he was at Athens. He saw too, what was a still more speaking trophy, the actual chains in which the prisoners had been fettered, exhibiting in their appearance the damage undergone when the acropolis was burnt by Xerxês: an inscription of four lines described the offerings and recorded the victory out of which they had sprung.[1]

Another consequence of some moment arose out of this victory. The Athenians planted a body of 4000 of their citizens as Klêruchs (lot-holders) or settlers upon the lands of the wealthy Chalkidian oligarchy called the Hippobotæ —proprietors probably in the fertile plain of Lêlantum between Chalkis and Eretria. This is a system which we shall find hereafter extensively followed out by the Athenians in the days of their power; partly with the view of providing for their poorer citizens—partly to serve as garrison among a population either hostile or of doubtful fidelity. These Attic Klêruchs (I can find no other name by which to speak of them) did not lose their birthright as Athenian citizens. They were not colonists in the Grecian sense, and they are known by a totally different name, but they corresponded very nearly to the colonies formerly planted out on the conquered lands by Rome. The

Plantation of Athenian settlers or Klêruchs in the territory of Chalkis.

[1] Herodot. v. 77; Ælian, V. H. vi. 1; Pausan. i. 28, 2.

increase of the poorer population was always more or less painfully felt in every Grecian city; for though the aggregate population never seems to have increased very fast, yet the multiplication of children in poor families caused the subdivision of the smaller lots of land, until at last they became insufficient for a maintenance; and the persons thus impoverished found it difficult to obtain subsistence in other ways, more especially as the labour for the richer classes was so much performed by imported slaves. Doubtless some families possessed of landed property became extinct. Yet this did not at all benefit the smaller and poorer proprietors, for the lands rendered vacant passed, not to them, but by inheritance or bequest or intermarriage to other proprietors for the most part in easy circumstances, since one opulent family usually intermarried with another. I shall enter more fully at a future opportunity into this question—the great and serious problem of population, as it affected the Greek communities generally, and as it was dealt with in theory by the powerful minds of Plato and Aristotle—at present it is sufficient to notice that the numerous Klêruchies sent out by Athens, of which this to Eubœa was the first, arose in a great measure out of the multiplication of the poorer population, which her extended power was employed in providing for. Her subsequent proceedings with a view to the same object will not be always found so justifiable as this now before us, which grew naturally, according to the ideas of the time, out of her success against the Chalkidians.

Distress of the Thebans—they ask assistance from Ægina.

The war between Athens, however, and Thêbes with her Bœotian allies, still continued, to the great and repeated disadvantage of the latter, until at length the Thebans in despair sent to ask advice of the Delphian oracle, and were directed to "solicit aid from those nearest to them".[1] "How (they replied) are we to obey? Our nearest neighbours, of Tanagra, Korôneia, and Thespiæ, are now, and have been from the beginning, lending us all the aid in their power." An ingenious Theban, however, coming to the relief of his perplexed fellow-citizens, dived into the depths of legend and brought up a happy meaning. "Those nearest to

[1] Herodot. v 80.

us (he said) are the inhabitants of Ægina: for Thêbê (the eponym of Thêbes) and Ægina (the eponym of that island) were both sisters, daughters of Asôpus. Let us send to crave assistance from the Æginetans." If his subtle interpretation (founded upon their descent from the same legendary progenitors) did not at once convince all who heard it, at least no one had any better to suggest. Envoys were at once sent to the Æginetans; who, in reply to a petition founded on legendary claims, sent to the help of the Thebans a reinforcement of legendary, but venerated, auxiliaries—the Æakid heroes. We are left to suppose that their effigies are here meant. It was in vain however that the glory and the supposed presence of the Æakids Telamôn and Pêleus were introduced into the Theban camp. Victory still continued on the side of Athens; so that the discouraged Thebans again sent to Ægina, restoring the heroes,[1] and praying for aid of a character more human and positive. Their request was granted, and the Æginetans commenced war against Athens, without even the decent preliminary of a herald and declaration.[2]

The Æginetans make war on Athens.

This remarkable embassy first brings us into acquaintance with the Dorians of Ægina—oligarchical, wealthy, commercial, and powerful at sea, even in the earliest days; more analogous to Corinth than to any of the other cities called Dorian. The hostility which they now began without provocation against Athens—repressed by Sparta at the critical moment of the battle of Marathôn—then again breaking out—and hushed for a while by the common dangers of

[1] In the expression of Herodotus, the Æakid heroes are *really* sent from Ægina, and *really* sent back by the Thebans (v. 80, 81)—*Οἱ δέ σφι αἰτέουσι ἐπικουρίην τοὺς Αἰακίδας συμπέμπειν ἔφασαν—αὐτῖς οἱ Θηβαῖοι πέμψαντες, τοὺς μὲν Αἰακίδας σφι ἀπεδίδοσαν, τῶν δὲ ἀνδρῶν ἐδέοντο.* Compare again v. 75; viii. 64; and Polyb. vii. 9, 2. *θεῶν τῶν συστρατευομένων.*

Justin gives a narrative of an analogous application from the Epizephyrian Lokrians to Sparta (xx. 3): "Territi Locrenses ad Spartanos decurrunt: auxilium supplices deprecantur: illi longinquâ militiâ gravati, auxilium a Castore et Polluce petere eos jubent. Neque legati responsum sociæ urbis spreverunt; profectique in proximum templum, facto sacrificio, auxilium deorum implorant. Litatis hostiis, *obtentoque, ut rebantur, quod petebant—haud secus lœti quam si deos ipsos secum avecturi essent*—pulvinaria iis in navi componunt, faustisque profecti ominibus, *solatia suis pro auxiliis* deportant." In comparing the expressions of Herodotus with those of Justin, we see that the former believes the direct literal presence and action of the Æakid heroes ("the Thebans sent back the heroes, and asked for men"), while the latter explains away the divine intervention into a mere fancy and feeling on the part of those to whom it is supposed to be accorded. This was the tone of those later authors whom Justin followed: compare also Pausan. iii. 19, 2.

[2] Herodot. v. 81, 82.

the Persian invasion under Xerxês, was appeased only with the conquest of the island about twenty years after that event, and with the expulsion and destruction of its inhabitants. There had been indeed, according to Herodotus,[1] a feud of great antiquity between Athens and Ægina—of which he gives the account in a singular narrative blending together religion, politics, exposition of ancient customs, &c. But at the time when the Thebans solicited aid from Ægina, the latter was at peace with Athens. The Æginetans employed their fleet, powerful for that day, in ravaging Phalêrum and the maritime demes of Attica; nor had the Athenians as yet any fleet to resist them.[2] It is probable that the desired effect was produced, of diverting a portion of the Athenian force from the war against Bœotia, and thus partially relieving Thêbes; but the war of Athens against both of them continued for a considerable time, though we have no information respecting its details.

Preparations at Sparta to attack Athens anew—the Spartan allies summoned, together with Hippias.

Meanwhile the attention of Athens was called off from these combined enemies by a more menacing cloud which threatened to burst upon her from the side of Sparta. Kleomenês and his countrymen, full of resentment at the late inglorious desertion of Eleusis, were yet more incensed by the discovery, which appears to have been then recently made, that the injunctions of the Delphian priestess for the expulsion of Hippias from Athens had been fraudulently procured.[3] Moreover Kleomenês, when shut up in the acropolis of Athens with Isagoras, had found there various prophecies previously treasured up by the Peisistratids, many of which foreshadowed events highly disastrous to Sparta. And while the recent brilliant manifestations of courage and repeated victories, on the part of Athens, seemed to indicate that such prophecies might perhaps be realised, Sparta had to reproach herself, that, from the foolish and mischievous conduct of Kleomenês, she had undone the effect of her previous aid against the Peisistratids, and thus lost that return of gratitude which the Athenians would otherwise have testified. Under such impressions, the Spartan authorities took the remarkable step of sending for Hippias from his residence at

1 Herodot. v. 83—88.
2 Herodot. v. 81—89. μεγάλως Ἀθη- ναίους ἐσινέοντο.
3 Herodot. v. 90.

Sigeium to Peloponnêsus, and of summoning deputies from all their allies to meet him at Sparta.

The convocation thus summoned deserves notice as the commencement of a new era in Grecian politics. The previous expedition of Kleomenês against Attica presents to us the first known example of Spartan headship passing from theory into act: that expedition miscarried because the allies, though willing to follow, would not follow blindly, nor be made the instruments of executing purposes repugnant to their feelings. Sparta had now learnt the necessity, in order to ensure their hearty concurrence, of letting them know what she contemplated, so as to ascertain at least that she had no decided opposition to apprehend. Here then is the third stage in the spontaneous movement of Greece towards a systematic conjunction, however imperfect, of its many autonomous units: first we have Spartan headship suggested in theory, from a concourse of circumstances which attract to her the admiration of all Greece — power, unrivalled training, undisturbed antiquity, &c.: next, the theory passes into act, yet rude and shapeless: lastly, the act becomes clothed with formalities and preceded by discussion and determination. The first convocation of the allies at Sparta, for the purpose of having a common object submitted to their consideration, may well be regarded as an important event in Grecian political history: the proceedings at the convocation are no less important, as an indication of the way in which the Greeks of that day felt and acted, and must be borne in mind as a contrast with times hereafter to be described.

First formal convocation at Sparta—march of Greece towards a political system.

Hippias having been presented to the assembled allies, the Spartans expressed their sorrow for having dethroned him—their resentment and alarm at the new-born insolence of Athens,[1] already tasted by her immediate neighbours, and menacing to every state represented in the convocation—and their anxiety to restore Hippias, not less as a reparation of past wrong, than as a means, through his rule, of keeping Athens low and dependent. But the proposition, though emanating from Sparta, was listened to by the allies with one common sentiment of

[1] Herodot. v. 90, 91.

repugnance. They had no sympathy for Hippias—no dislike, still less any fear, of Athens—and a profound detestation of the character of a despot. The spirit which had animated the armed contingents at Eleusis now reappeared among the deputies at Sparta, and the Corinthians again took the initiative. Their deputy Sosiklês protested against the project in the fiercest and most indignant strain. No language can be stronger than that of the long harangue which Herodotus puts into his mouth, wherein the bitter recollections prevalent at Corinth respecting Kypselus and Periander are poured forth. "Surely heaven and earth are about to change places—the fish are coming to dwell on dry land, and mankind going to inhabit the sea—when you, Spartans, propose to subvert the popular governments, and to set up in the cities that wicked and bloody thing called a Despot.[1] First try what it is for yourselves at Sparta, and then force it upon others if you can: you have not tasted its calamities as we have, and you take very good care to keep it away from yourselves. We adjure you by the common gods of Hellas—plant not despots in her cities: if you persist in a scheme so wicked, know that the Corinthians will not second you."

Proceedings of the convocation —animated protest of Corinth against any interference in favour of Hippias— the Spartan allies refuse to interfere.

This animated appeal was received with a shout of approbation and sympathy on the part of the allies. All with one accord united with Sosiklês in adjuring the Lacedæmonians[2] "not to revolutionise any Hellenic city". No one listened to Hippias when he replied, and warned the Corinthians that the time would come, when they, more than any one else, would dread and abhor the Athenian democracy, and wish the Peisistratidæ back again. "He knew well (says Herodotus) that this would be, for he was better acquainted with the prophecies than any man; but no one then believed him, and he was forced to take his departure back to Sigeium; the Spartans not venturing to espouse his cause against the determined sentiment of the allies."[3]

That determined sentiment deserves notice, because it marks the present period of the Hellenic mind: fifty years later it will

[1] Herodot. v. 92. . . . *τυραννίδας ἐς τὰς πόλις κατάγειν παρασκευάζεσθε, τοῦ οὔτε ἀδικώτερον οὐδέν ἐστι κατ' ἀνθρώπους οὔτε μιαιφονώτερον.*

[2] Herodot. v. 93. *μὴ ποιέειν μηδὲν νεώτερον περὶ πόλιν Ἑλλάδα.*

[3] Herodot. v. 93, 94.

be found materially altered. Aversion to single-headed rule, and bitter recollection of men like Kypselus and Periander, are now the chords which thrill in an assembly of Grecian deputies. The idea of a revolution (implying thereby an organic and comprehensive change of which the party using the word disapproves) consists in substituting a permanent One in place of those periodical magistrates and assemblies which were the common attribute of oligarchy and democracy; the antithesis between these last two is as yet in the background, and there prevails neither fear of Athens nor hatred of the Athenian democracy. But when we turn to the period immediately before the Peloponnesian war, we find the order of precedence between these two sentiments reversed. The anti-monarchical feeling has not perished, but has been overlaid by other and more recent political antipathies — the antithesis between democracy and oligarchy having become, not indeed the only sentiment, but the uppermost sentiment, in the minds of Grecian politicians generally, and the soul of active party movement. Moreover a hatred of the most deadly character has grown up against Athens and her democracy, especially in the grandsons of those very Corinthians who now stand forward as her sympathising friends. The remarkable change of feeling here mentioned is nowhere so strikingly exhibited as when we contrast the address of the Corinthian Sosiklês just narrated with the speech of the Corinthian envoys at Sparta immediately antecedent to the Peloponnesian war, as given to us in Thucydidês.[1] It will hereafter be fully explained by the intermediate events, by the growth of Athenian power, and by the still more miraculous development of Athenian energy.

Aversion to single-headed rule —now predominant in Greece.

Such development, the fruit of the fresh-planted democracy as well as the seed for its sustentation and aggrandisement, continued progressive during the whole period just adverted to; but the first unexpected burst of it, under the Kleisthenean constitution and after the expulsion of Hippias, is described by Herodotus in terms too emphatic to be omitted. After narrating the successive victories of the Athenians over both Bœo-

[1] Thucydid. i. 68—71, 120—124.

tians and Chalkidians, that historian proceeds—"Thus did the Athenians grow in strength. And we may find proof not merely in this instance but everywhere else how valuable a thing freedom is: since even the Athenians, while under a despot, were not superior in war to any of their surrounding neighbours, but so soon as they got rid of their despots, became by far the first of all. These things show that while kept down by one man, they were slack and timid, like men working for a master; but when they were liberated, every single man became eager in exertions for his own benefit." The same comparison reappears a short time afterwards, where he tells us that "the Athenians, when free, felt themselves a match for Sparta; but while kept down by any man under a despotism were feeble and apt for submission".[1]

Striking development of Athenian energy after the revolution of Kleisthenês—language of Herodotus.

Stronger expressions cannot be found to depict the rapid improvement wrought in the Athenian people by their new democracy. Of course this did not arise merely from suspension of previous cruelties, or from better laws, or better administration. These indeed were essential conditions, but the active transforming cause here was, the principle and system of which such amendments formed the detail: the grand and new idea of the sovereign People, composed of free and equal citizens—or liberty and equality, to use words which so profoundly moved the French nation half a century ago. It was this comprehensive political idea which acted with electric effect upon the Athenians, creating within them a host of sentiments, motives, sympathies, and capacities, to which they had before been strangers. Democracy in Grecian antiquity possessed the privilege, not only of kindling an earnest and unanimous attachment to the constitution in the bosoms of the citizens, also but of creating an energy of public and private action, such as could never be obtained under an oligarchy, where

Effect upon their minds of the idea or theory of democracy.

[1] Herodot. v. 78—91. Ἀθηναῖοι μέν νυν ηὔξηντο· δηλοῖ δὲ οὐ κατ' ἓν μόνον ἀλλὰ πανταχῇ, ἡ ἰσηγορίη ὡς ἔστι χρῆμα σπουδαῖον, εἰ καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι τυραννευόμενοι μὲν, οὐδαμῶν τῶν σφέας περιοικεόντων ἔσαν τὰ πολέμια ἀμείνονες, ἀπαλλαχθέντες δὲ τυράννων, μακρῷ πρῶτοι ἐγένοντο· δηλοῖ ὧν ταῦτα, ὅτι κατεχόμενοι μὲν, ἐθελοκάκεον, ὡς δεσπότῃ ἐργαζόμενοι, ἐλευθερωθέντων δὲ, αὐτὸς ἕκαστος ἑωυτῷ προθυμέετο κατεργάζεσθαι. (c. 91.) Οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι—νόῳ λαβόντες, ὡς ἐλεύθερον μὲν ἐὸν τὸ γένος τὸ Ἀττικὸν, ἰσόρροπον τῷ ἑωυτῶν ἂν γένοιτο, κατεχόμενον δὲ ὑπό τον τυραννίδι, ἀσθενὲς καὶ πειθαρχέεσθαι ἑτοῖμον.

the utmost that could be hoped for was a passive acquiescence and obedience. Mr. Burke has remarked that the mass of the people are generally very indifferent about theories of government; but such indifference (although improvements in the practical working of all governments tend to foster it) is hardly to be expected among any people who exhibit decided mental activity and spirit on other matters; and the reverse was unquestionably true, in the year 500 B.C., among the communities of ancient Greece. Theories of goverment were there anything but a dead letter, they were connected with emotions of the strongest as well as of the most opposite character. The theory of a permanent ruling One, for example, was universally odious: that of a ruling Few, though acquiesced in, was never positively attractive, unless either where it was associated with the maintenance of peculiar education and habits, as at Sparta, or where it presented itself as the only antithesis to democracy, the latter having by peculiar circumstances become an object of terror. But the theory of democracy was pre-eminently seductive; creating in the mass of the citizens an intense positive attachment, and disposing them to voluntary action and suffering on its behalf, such as no coercion on the part of other governments could extort. Herodotus,[1] in his comparison of the three sorts of government, puts in the front rank of the advantages of democracy "its most splendid name and promise"—its power of enlisting the hearts of the citizens in support of their constitution, and of providing for all a common bond of union and fraternity. This is what even democracy did not always do: but it was what no other government in Greece *could* do: a reason alone sufficient to stamp it as the best government, and presenting the greatest chance of beneficent results, for a Grecian community. Among the Athenian citizens, certainly it produced a strength and unanimity of positive political sentiment, such as has rarely been seen in the history of mankind, which excites our surprise and admiration the more when we compare it with the apathy which

[1] Herodot. iii. 80. Πλῆθος δὲ ἄρχον, πρῶτα μέν, οὔνομα πάντων κάλλιστον ἔχει, ἰσονομίην· δεύτερα δὲ, τούτων τῶν ὁ μούναρχος, ποιέει οὐδέν· πάλῳ μὲν ἀρχὰς ἄρχει, ὑπεύθυνον δὲ ἀρχὴν ἔχει, βουλεύματα δὲ πάντα ἐς τὸ κοινὸν ἀναφέρει.

The democratical speaker at Syracuse, Athenagoras, also puts this name and promise in the first rank of advantages—(Thucyd. vi. 39)—ἐγὼ δέ φημι, πρῶτα μέν, δῆμον ξύμπαν ὠνομάσθαι, ἀλιναρχίαν δὲ μέρος, &c.

had preceded, and which is even implied as the natural state of the public mind in Solôn's famous proclamation against neutrality in a sedition.[1] Because democracy happens to be unpalatable to most modern readers, they have been accustomed to look upon the sentiment here described only in its least honourable manifestations—in the caricatures of Aristophanês, or in the empty commonplaces of rhetorical declaimers. But it is not in this way that the force, the earnestness, or the binding value of democratical sentiment at Athens is to be measured. We must listen to it as it comes from the lips of Periklês,[2] while he is strenuously enforcing upon the people those active duties for which it both implanted the stimulus and supplied the courage; or from the oligarchical Nikias in the harbour of Syracuse, when he is endeavouring to revive the courage of his despairing troops for one last death-struggle, and when he appeals to their democratical patriotism as to the only flame yet alive and burning even in that moment of agony.[3] From the time of Kleisthenês downward, the creation of this new mighty impulse makes an entire revolution in the Athenian character; and if the change still stood out in so prominent a manner before the eyes of Herodotus, much more must it have been felt by the contemporaries among whom it occurred.

The attachment of an Athenian citizen to his democratical constitution comprised two distinct veins of sentiment: first, his rights, protection, and advantages derived from it—next, his obligations of exertion and sacrifice towards it and with reference to it. Neither of these two veins of sentiment was ever wholly absent; but according as the one or the other was present at different times in varying proportions, the patriotism of the citizen was a very different feeling. That which Herodotus remarks is, the extraordinary efforts of heart and hand which the Athenians suddenly displayed—the efficacy of the active sentiment throughout the bulk of the citizens.

Patriotism of an Athenian between 500—400 B.C. —combined with an eager spirit of personal military exertion and sacrifice.

[1] See the preceding chapter xi. of this History, vol. ii. p. 509, respecting the Solonian declaration here adverted to.

[2] See the two speeches of Periklês in Thucyd. ii. 35—46, and ii. 60—64. Compare the reflections of Thucydidês upon the two democracies of Athens and Syracuse—vi. 69 and vii. 21—55.

[3] Thucyd. vii. 69. Πατρίδος τε τῆς ἐλευθερωτάτης ὑπομιμνήσκων καὶ τῆς ἐν αὐτῇ ἀνεπιτακτοῦ πᾶσιν ἐς τὴν δίαιταν ἐξουσίας, &c.

We shall observe even more memorable evidences of the same phænomenon in tracing down the History from Kleisthenês to the end of the Peloponnesian war: we shall trace a series of events and motives eminently calculated to stimulate that self-imposed labour and discipline which the early democracy had first called forth. But when we advance farther down, from the restoration of the democracy after the Thirty Tyrants, to the time of Demosthenês—(I venture upon this brief anticipation, in the conviction that one period of Grecian history can only be thoroughly understood by contrasting it with another)—we shall find a sensible change in Athenian patriotism. The active sentiment of obligation is comparatively inoperative—the citizen, it is true, has a keen sense of the value of the democracy as protecting him and ensuring to him valuable rights, and he is moreover willing to perform his ordinary sphere of legal duties towards it; but he looks upon it as a thing established, and capable of maintaining itself in a due measure of foreign ascendency, without any such personal efforts as those which his forefathers cheerfully imposed upon themselves. The orations of Demosthenês contain melancholy proofs of such altered tone of patriotism—of that languor, paralysis, and waiting for others to act which preceded the catastrophe of Chæroneia, notwithstanding an unabated attachment to the democracy as a source of protection and good government.[1] That same preternatural activity which the allies of Sparta, at the beginning of the Peloponnesian war, both denounced and admired in the Athenians, is noted by the orator as now belonging to their enemy Philip. Such variations in the scale of national energy pervade history, modern as well as ancient, but in regard to Grecian history, especially, they can never be overlooked. For a certain measure, not only of positive political attachment, but also of active self-devotion, military readiness, and personal effort, was the indispensable condition of maintaining Hellenic autonomy, either in Athens or elsewhere; and became so more than ever, when the Macedonians were once organised under an

Diminution of this active sentiment in the restored democracy after the Thirty Tyrants.

[1] Compare the remarkable speech of the Corinthian envoys at Sparta (Thucyd. i. 68—71), with the φιλοπραγμοσύνη which Demosthenês so emphatically notices in Philip (Olynthiac. i. 6, p. 13): also *Philippic.* i. 2, and the Philippics and Olynthiacs generally.

enterprising and semi-hellenised prince. The democracy was the first creative cause of that astonishing personal and many-sided energy which marked the Athenian character, for a century downward from Kleisthenês; that the same ultra-Hellenic activity did not longer continue is referable to other causes which will be hereafter in part explained. No system of government, even supposing it to be very much better and more faultless than the Athenian democracy, can ever pretend to accomplish its legitimate end apart from the personal character of the people, or to supersede the necessity of individual virtue and vigour. During the half-century immediately preceding the battle of Chæroneia, the Athenians had lost that remarkable energy which distinguished them during the first century of their democracy, and had fallen much more nearly to a level with the other Greeks, in common with whom they were obliged to yield to the pressure of a foreign enemy. I here briefly notice their last period of languor, in contrast with the first burst of democratical fervour under Kleisthenês now opening—a feeling which will be found, as we proceed, to continue for a longer period than could have been reasonably anticipated, but which was too high-strung to become a perpetual and inherent attribute of any community.

# CHAPTER XXXII.

## RISE OF THE PERSIAN EMPIRE.—CYRUS.

In the preceding chapter I have followed the history of Central Greece very nearly down to the point at which the history of the Asiatic Greeks becomes blended with it, and after which the two streams begin to flow to a great degree in the same channel. I now revert to the affairs of the Asiatic Greeks, and of the Asiatic kings as connected with them, at the point in which they were left in my seventeenth chapter.

The concluding facts recounted in that chapter were of sad and serious moment to the Hellenic world. The Ionic and Æolic Greeks on the Asiatic coast had been conquered and made tributary by the Lydian king Crœsus: "down to that time (says Herodotus) all Greeks had been free". Their conqueror Crœsus, who ascended the throne in 560 B.C., appeared to be at the summit of human prosperity and power in his unassailable capital, and with his countless treasures at Sardis. His dominions comprised nearly the whole of Asia Minor, as far as the river Halys to the east; on the other side of that river began the Median monarchy under his brother-in-law Astyagês, extending eastward to some boundary which we cannot define, but comprising in a south-eastern direction Persis Proper or Farsistan, and separated from the Kissians and Assyrians on the east by the line of Mount Zagros (the present boundary-line between Persia and Turkey). Babylonia, with its wondrous city, between the Euphrates and the Tigris, was occupied by the Assyrians or Chaldæans, under their king Labynêtus: a territory populous and fertile, partly by nature, partly by prodigies of labour, to a degree which makes us mistrust even an honest

State of the Asiatic Greeks after the conquest of Lydia by Cyrus.

eye-witness, who describes it afterwards in its decline, but which was then in its most flourishing condition. The Chaldæan dominion under Labynêtus reached to the borders of Egypt, including as dependent territories both Judæa and Phœnicia. In Egypt reigned the native king Amasis, powerful and affluent, sustained in his throne by a large body of Grecian mercenaries, and himself favourably disposed to Grecian commerce and settlement. Both with Labynêtus and with Amasis, Crœsus was on terms of alliance; and as Astyagês was his brother-in-law, the four kings might well be deemed out of the reach of calamity. Yet within the space of thirty years or a little more, the whole of their territories had become embodied in one vast empire, under the son of an adventurer as yet not known even by name.

Great power and alliances of Crœsus.

The rise and fall of oriental dynasties have been in all times distinguished by the same general features. A brave and adventurous prince, at the head of a population at once poor, warlike, and greedy, acquires dominion; while his successors, abandoning themselves to sensuality and sloth, probably also to oppressive and irascible dispositions, become in process of time victims to those same qualities in a stranger which had enabled their own father to seize the throne. Cyrus, the great founder of the Persian empire, first the subject and afterwards the dethroner of the Median Astyagês, corresponds to this general description, as far at least as we can pretend to know his history. For in truth, even the conquests of Cyrus, after he became ruler of Media, are very imperfectly known, whilst the facts which preceded his rise up to that sovereignty cannot be said to be known at all: we have to choose between different accounts at variance with each other, and of which the most complete and detailed is stamped with all the character of romance. The Cyropædia of Xenophôn is memorable and interesting, considered with reference to the Greek mind, and as a philosophical novel.[1] That it should have been quoted so largely as authority on matters of history, is only one proof among many how easily authors have been satisfied as to the

Rise of Cyrus—uncertainty of his early history.

[1] Among the lost productions of Antisthenês, the contemporary of Xenophôn and Plato, and emanating like them from the tuition of Sokratês, was one, Κῦρος, ἢ περὶ Βασιλείας (Diogen. Laërt. vi. 15).

essentials of historical evidence. The narrative given by Herodotus of the relations between Cyrus and Astyagês, agreeing with Xenophôn in little more than the fact that it makes Cyrus son of Kambysês and Mandanê and grandson of Astyagês, goes even beyond the story of Romulus and Remus in respect to tragical incident and contrast. Astyagês, alarmed by a dream, condemns the new-born infant of his daughter Mandanê to be exposed: Harpagus, to whom the order is given, delivers the child to one of the royal herdsmen, who exposes it in the mountains, where it is miraculously suckled by a bitch.[1] Thus preserved, and afterwards brought up as the herdsman's child, Cyrus manifests great superiority both physical and mental, is chosen king in play by the boys of the village, and in this capacity severely chastises the son of one of the courtiers; for which offence he is carried before Astyagês, who recognises him for his grandson, but is assured by the Magi that the dream is out, and that he has no farther danger to apprehend from the boy, and therefore permits him to live. With Harpagus, however, Astyagês is extremely incensed, for not having executed his orders: he causes the son of Harpagus to be slain, and served up to be eaten by his unconscious father at a regal banquet. The father, apprised afterwards of the fact, dissembles his feelings, but meditates a deadly vengeance against Astyagês for this Thyestean meal. He persuades Cyrus, who has been sent back to his father and mother in Persia, to head a revolt of the Persians against the Medes; whilst Astyagês—to fill up the Grecian conception of

Story of Astyagês.

[1] That this was the real story—a close parallel of Romulus and Remus—we may see by Herodotus, i. 122. Some rationalising Greeks or Persians transformed it into a more plausible tale—that the herdsman's wife who suckled the boy Cyrus was named Κυνώ (Κυών is a dog, male or female); contending that this latter was the real basis of fact, and that the intervention of the bitch was an exaggeration built upon the name of the woman, in order that the divine protection shown to Cyrus might be still more manifest—οἱ δὲ τοκέες παραλαβόντες τὸ οὔνομα τοῦτο (ἵνα θειοτέρως δοκέῃ τοῖσι Πέρσῃσι περιεῖναι σφι ὁ παῖς), κατέβαλον φάτιν ὡς ἐκκείμενον Κῦρον κύων ἐξέθρεψε· ἐνθεῦτεν μὲν ἡ φάτις αὐτὴ κεχωρήκεε.

In the first volume of this History I have noticed various tranformations operated by Palæphatus and others upon the Greek mythes—the ram which carried Phryxus and Hellê across the Hellespont is represented to us as having been in *reality* a man *named Krius*, who aided their flight—the winged horse which carried Bellerophôn was a ship *named* Pegasus, &c.

This same operation has here been performed upon the story of the suckling of Cyrus; for we shall run little risk in affirming that the miraculous story is the older of the two. The feelings which welcome a miraculous story are early and primitive; those which break down the miracle into a commonplace fact are of subsequent growth.

madness as a percursor to ruin—sends an army against the revolters, commanded by Harpagus himself. Of course the army is defeated—Astyagês after a vain resistance is dethroned—Cyrus becomes king in his place—and Harpagus repays the outrage which he has undergone by the bitterest insults.

Such are the heads of a beautiful narrative which is given at some length in Herodotus. It will probably appear to the reader sufficiently romantic; though the historian intimates that he had heard three other narratives different from it, and that all were more full of marvels, as well as in wider circulation, than his own, which he had borrowed from some unusually sober-minded Persian informants.[1] In what points the other three stories departed from it we do not hear.

Herodotus and Ktêsias.

To the historian of Halikarnassus we have to oppose the physician of the neighbouring town Knidus—Ktêsias, who contradicted Herodotus, not without strong terms of censure, on many points, and especially upon that which is the very foundation of the early narrative respecting Cyrus; for he affirmed that Cyrus was noway related to Astyagês.[2] However indignant we may be with Ktêsias for the disparaging epithets which he presumed to apply to an historian, whose work is to us inestimable—we must nevertheless admit, that as surgeon in actual attendance on king Artaxerxês Mnêmôn, and healer of the wound inflicted on that prince at Kunaxa by his brother Cyrus the younger,[3] he had better opportunities even than Herodotus of conversing with sober-minded Persians; and that the discrepancies between the two statements are to be taken as a proof of the prevalence of discordant, yet equally accredited, stories. Herodotus

[1] Herodot. i. 95. Ὡς ὦν Περσέων μετεξέτεροι λέγουσι, οἱ μὴ βουλόμενοι σεμνοῦν τα περὶ Κῦρον, ἀλλὰ τὸν ἐόντα λέγειν λόγον, κατὰ ταῦτα γράψω· ἐπιστάμενος περὶ Κύρου και τριφασίας ἄλλας λόγων ὁδοὺς φήναι. His informants were thus select persons, who differed from the Persians generally.

The long narrative respecting the infancy and growth of Cyrus is contained in Herodot. i. 107—129.

[2] See the Extracts from the lost Persian History of Ktêsias, in Phôtius Cod. lxxii., also appended to Schweighäuser's edition of Herodotus, vol. iv. p. 345. Φησὶ δὲ (Ktêsias) αὐτὸν τῶν πλειόνων ἀ ἱστορεῖ αὐτόπτην γενόμενον, ἢ παρ' αὐτῶν Περσῶν (ἔνθα τὸ ὁρᾶν μὴ ἐνεχώρει) αὐτήκοον καταστάντα, οὕτως τὴν ἱστορίαν συγγράψαι.

To the discrepancies between Xenophôn, Herodotus, and Ktêsias, on the subject of Cyrus, is to be added the statement of Æschylus (Persæ, 747), the oldest authority of them all, and that of the Armenian historians: see Bähr ad Ktesiam, p. 85; compare Bähr's comments on the discrepancies, p. 87.

[3] Xenophôn, Anabas. i. 8, 26.

himself was in fact compelled to choose one out of four. So rare and late a plant is historical authenticity.

That Cyrus was the first Persian conqueror, and that the space which he overran covered no less than fifty degrees of longitude, from the coast of Asia Minor to the Oxus and the Indus, are facts quite indisputable; but of the steps by which this was achieved we know very little. The native Persians, whom he conducted to an empire so immense, were an aggregate of seven agricultural and four nomadic tribes—all of them rude, hardy, and brave[1]—dwelling in a mountainous region, clothed in skins, ignorant of wine, or fruit, or any of the commonest luxuries of life, and despising the very idea of purchase or sale. Their tribes were very unequal in point of dignity, probably also in respect to numbers and powers, among one another. First in estimation among them stood the Pasargadæ; and the first phratry or clan among the Pasargadæ were the Achæmenidæ, to whom Cyrus himself belonged. Whether his relationship to the Median king whom he dethroned was a matter of fact or a politic fiction, we cannot well determine. But Xenophôn, in noticing the spacious deserted cities, Larissa and Mespila,[2] which he saw in his march with the Ten Thousand Greeks on the eastern side of the Tigris, gives us to understand that the conquest of Media by the Persians was reported to him as having been an obstinate and protracted struggle. However this may be, the preponderance of the Persians was at last complete: though the Medes always continued to be the second nation in the empire, after the Persians, properly so called; and by early Greek writers the great enemy in the east is often called "the Mede"[3] as well as "the Persian". The Median Ekbatana too remained as one of the capital cities, and the usual summer residence of the kings of Persia; Susa on the Choaspês, on the Kissian plain farther southward, and east of the Tigris, being their winter abode.

Condition of the native Persians at the first rise of Cyrus.

The vast space of country comprised between the Indus on

[1] Herodot. i. 71—153; Arrian, v. 4; Strabo, xv. p. 727; Plato, Legg. iii. p. 695.

[2] Xenophôn, Anabas. iii. 3, 6; iii. 4, 7—12. Strabo had read accounts which represented the last battle between Astyagês and Cyrus to have been fought near Pasargadæ (xv. p. 730).

[3] Xenophanês, Fragm. p. 39, ap. Schneidewin, Delectus Poett. Elegiac. Græc.—

Πήλικος ἦσθ' ὅθ' ὁ Μῆδος ἀφίκετο;

compare Theognis, v. 775, and Herodot. i. 163.

the east, the Oxus and Caspian Sea to the north, the Persian Gulf and Indian Ocean to the south, and the line of Mount Zagros to the west, appears to have been occupied in these times by a great variety of different tribes and people, yet all or most of them belonging to the religion of Zoroaster, and speaking dialects of the Zend language.[1] It was known amongst its inhabitants by the common name of Iran or Aria: it is, in its central parts at least, a high, cold plateau, totally destitute of wood and scantily supplied with water; much of it indeed is a salt and sandy desert, unsusceptible of culture. Parts of it are eminently fertile, where water can be procured and irrigation applied. Scattered masses of tolerably dense population thus grew up; but continuity of cultivation is not practicable, and in ancient times, as at present, a large proportion of the population of Iran seems to have consisted of wandering or nomadic tribes with their tents and cattle. The rich pastures, and the freshness of the summer climate, in the region of mountain and valley near Ekbatana, are extolled by modern travellers, just as they attracted the Great King in ancient times during the hot months. The more southerly province called Persis Proper (Farsistan) consists also in part of mountain land interspersed with valley and plain, abundantly watered, and ample in pasture, sloping gradually down to low grounds on the sea-coast which are hot and dry: the care bestowed, both by Medes and Persians, on the breeding of their horses, was remarkable.[2] There were doubtless material differences between different parts of the population of this vast plateau of Iran. Yet it seems that along with their common language and religion, they had also something of a common character, which contrasted with the Indian population east of the Indus, the Assyrians west of Mount Zagros, and the Massagetæ and other Nomads of the Caspian and the Sea of Aral —less brutish, restless, and bloodthirsty than the latter— more fierce, contemptuous, and extortionate, and less capable of sustained industry than the two former. There can be little doubt,

Territory of Iran—between Tigris and Indus.

[1] Strabo, xv. p. 724. ὁμόγλωττοι παρὰ μικρόν. See Heeren, Ueber den Verkehr der Alten Welt, part i. book i. p. 320—340, and Ritter, Erdkunde, West-Asien, b. iii., Abtheil ii., sects. 1 and 2, p. 17—84.

[2] About the province of Persis, see Strabo, xv. p. 727; Diodôr. xix. 21; Quintus Curtius, v. 13, 14, p. 432—434, with the valuable explanatory notes of Mützell (Berlin, 1841). Compare also Morier's Second Journey in Persia, p. 49—120, and Ritter, Erdkunde, West Asien, p. 712—738.

at the time of which we are now speaking, when the wealth and cultivation of Assyria were at their maximum, that Iran also was far better peopled than ever it has been since European observers have been able to survey it; especially the north-eastern portion, Baktria and Sogdiana; so that the invasions of the Nomads from Turkestan and Tartary, which have been so destructive at various intervals since the Mahomedan conquest, were before that period successfully kept back.

The general analogy among the population of Iran probably enabled the Persian conqueror with comparative ease to extend his empire to the east, after the conquest of Ekbatana, and to become the full heir of the Median kings. If we may believe Ktêsias, even the distant province of Baktria had been before subject to those kings. At first it resisted Cyrus, but finding that he had become son-in-law of Astyagês, as well as master of his person, it speedily acknowledged his authority.[1]

According to the representation of Herodotus, the war between Cyrus and Crœsus of Lydia began shortly after the capture of Astyagês, and before the conquest of Baktria.[2] Crœsus was the assailant, wishing to revenge his brother-in-law, to arrest the growth of the Persian conqueror, and to increase his own dominions. His more prudent councillors in vain represented to him that he had little to gain, and much to lose, by war with a nation alike hardy and poor. He is represented as just at that time recovering from the affliction arising out of the death of his son. War between Cyrus and Crœsus.

To ask advice of the oracle, before he took any final decision, was a step which no pious king would omit. But in the present perilous question Crœsus did more—he took a precaution so extreme, that if his piety had not been placed beyond all doubt by his extraordinary munificence to the temples, he might have drawn upon himself the suspicion of a guilty scepticism.[3] Before he would send to ask advice respecting the project itself, he resolved to test the credit of some of the chief surrounding

[1] Ktêsias, Persica, c. 2.

[2] Herodot. i. 153.

[3] That this point of view should not be noticed in Herodotus, may appear singular, when we read his story (vi. 86) about the Milesian Glaukus, and the judgment that overtook him for having tested the oracle; but it is put forward by Xenophôn as constituting part of the guilt of Crœsus (Cyropæd. vii. 2, 17).

oracles—Delphi, Dôdôna, Branchidæ near Milêtus, Amphiaraus at Thêbes, Trophônius at Lebadeia, and Ammôn in Libya. His envoys started from Sardis on the same day, and were all directed on the hundredth day afterwards to ask at the respective oracles how Crœsus was at that precise moment employed. This was a severe trial: of the manner in which it was met by four out of the six oracles consulted, we have no information, and it rather appears that their answers were unsatisfactory. But Amphiaraus maintained his credit undiminished, while Apollo at Delphi, more omniscient than Apollo at Branchidæ, solved the question with such unerring precision, as to afford a strong additional argument against persons who might be disposed to scoff at divination. No sooner had the envoys put the question to the Delphian priestess, on the day named, "What is Crœsus now doing?" than she exclaimed, in the accustomed hexameter verse,[1] "I know the number of grains of sand, and the measures of the sea: I understand the dumb, and I hear the man who speaks not. The smell reaches me of a hard-skinned tortoise boiled in a copper with lamb's flesh—copper above and copper below." Crœsus was awe-struck on receiving this reply. It described with the utmost detail that which he had been really doing, so that he accounted the Delphian oracle and that of Amphiaraus the only trustworthy oracles on earth—following up these feelings with a holocaust of the most munificent character, in order to win the favour of the Delphian god. Three thousand cattle were offered up, and upon a vast sacrificial pile were placed the most splendid purple robes and tunics, together with couches and censers of gold and silver; besides which he sent to Delphi itself the richest presents in gold and silver—ingots, statues, bowls, jugs, &c., the size and weight of which we read with astonishment: the more so as Herodotus himself saw them a century afterwards at Delphi.[2] Nor was Crœsus altogether unmindful of Amphiaraus, whose answer had been creditable, though less triumphant than that of the Pythian priestess. He sent to Amphiaraus a spear and shield of pure gold, which were afterwards seen at Thêbes by Herodotus: this large donative may help the reader to conceive the immensity of those which he sent to Delphi.

Crœsus tests the oracles—triumphant reply from Delphi—munificence of Crœsus to the oracle.

[1] Herodot. i. 47, 48, 49, 50.

[2] Herodot. i. 52, 53, 54.

The envoys who conveyed these gifts were instructed to ask at the same time, whether Crœsus should undertake an expedition against the Persians—and if so, whether he should solicit any allies to assist him. In regard to the second question, the answer both of Apollo and of Amphiaraus was decisive, recommending him to invite the alliance of the most powerful Greeks. In regard to the first and most momentous question, their answer was as remarkable for circumspection as it had been before for detective sagacity; they told Crœsus, that if he invaded the Persians, he would subvert a mighty monarchy. The blindness of Crœsus interpreted this declaration into an unqualified promise of success: he sent farther presents to the oracle, and again inquired whether his kingdom would be durable. "When a mule shall become king of the Medes (replied the priestess) then must thou run away—be not ashamed."[1]

Advice given to him by the oracle.

More assured than ever by such an answer, Crœsus sent to Sparta, under the kings Anaxandridês and Aristo, to tender presents and solicit their alliance.[2] His propositions were favourably entertained — the more so, as he had before gratuitously furnished some gold to the Lacedæmonians, for a statue to Apollo. The alliance now formed was altogether general—no express effort being as yet demanded from them, though it soon came to be. But the incident is to be noted, as marking the first plunge of the leading Grecian state into Asiatic politics; and that too without any of the generous Hellenic sympathy which afterwards induced Athens to send her citizens across the Ægean. At this time Crœsus was the master and tribute-exactor of the Asiatic Greeks, whose contingents seem to have formed part of his army for the expedition now contemplated; an army consisting principally, not of native Lydians, but of foreigners.

He solicits the alliance of Sparta.

The river Halys formed the boundary at this time between the Median and Lydian empires: and Crœsus, marching across that river into the territory of the Syrians or Assyrians of Kappadokia, took the city of Pteria, with many of its surrounding dependencies, inflicting damage and destruction upon these distant subjects

He crosses the Halys and attacks the Persians.

[1] Herodot. i. 55.

[2] Herodot. i. 67—70.

of Ekbatana. Cyrus lost no time in bringing an army to their defence considerably larger than that of Crœsus; trying at the same time, though unsuccessfully, to prevail on the Ionians to revolt from him. A bloody battle took place between the two armies, but with indecisive result: after which Crœsus, seeing that he could not hope to accomplish more with his forces as they stood, thought it wise to return to his capital, and collect a larger army for the next campaign. Immediately on reaching Sardis he despatched envoys to Labynêtus king of Babylon; to Amasis king of Egypt; to the Lacedæmonians, and to other allies; calling upon all of them to send auxiliaries to Sardis during the course of the fifth month. In the meantime, he dismissed all the foreign troops who had followed him into Kappadokia.[1]

Rapid march of Cyrus to Sardis.

Had these allies appeared, the war might perhaps have been prosecuted with success. And on the part of the Lacedæmonians at least there was no tardiness; for their ships were ready and their troops almost on board, when the unexpected news reached them that Crœsus was already ruined.[2] Cyrus had foreseen and forestalled the defensive plan of his enemy. Pushing on with his army to Sardis without delay, he obliged the Lydian prince to give battle with his own unassisted subjects. The open and spacious plain before that town was highly favourable to Lydian cavalry, which at that time (Herodotus tells us) was superior to the Persian. But Cyrus, employing a stratagem whereby this cavalry was rendered unavailable, placed in front of his line the baggage camels, which the Lydian horses could not endure either to smell or to behold.[3] The horsemen of Crœsus were thus obliged to dismount; nevertheless they fought bravely on foot, and were not driven into the town till after a sanguinary combat.

Siege and capture of Sardis.

Though confined within the walls of his capital, Crœsus had still good reason for hoping to hold out until the arrival of his allies, to whom he sent pressing envoys of acceleration. For Sardis was considered impregnable—one assault had already been repulsed, and the Persians

1 Herodot. i. 77.
2 Herodot. i. 83.
3 The story about this successful employment of the camels appears also in Xenophôn, Cyropæd. vii. 1, 47.

would have been reduced to the slow process of blockade. But on the fourteenth day of the siege, accident did for the besiegers that which they could not have accomplished either by skill or force. Sardis was situated on an outlying peak of the northern side of Tmôlus; it was well fortified everywhere except towards the mountain; and on that side the rock was so precipitous and inaccessible, that fortifications were thought unnecessary, nor did the inhabitants believe assault to be possible in that quarter. But Hyrœades, a Persian soldier, having accidentally seen one of the garrison descending this precipitous rock to pick up his helmet which had rolled down, watched his opportunity, tried to climb up, and found it not impracticable; others followed his example, the stronghold was thus seized first, and the whole city speedily taken by storm.[1]

Crœsus becomes prisoner of Cyrus—how treated.

Cyrus had given especial orders to spare the life of Crœsus, who was accordingly made prisoner. But preparations were made for a solemn and terrible spectacle; the captive king was destined to be burnt in chains, together with fourteen Lydian youths, on a vast pile of wood. We are even told that the pile was already kindled and the victim beyond the reach of human aid, when Apollo sent a miraculous rain to preserve him. As to the general fact of supernatural interposition, in one way or another, Herodotus and Ktêsias both agree, though they describe differently the particular miracles wrought.[2] It is certain that Crœsus, after some time,

1 Herodot. i. 84.

2 Compare Herodot. i. 84—87, and Ktêsias, Persica, c. 4; which latter seems to have been copied by Polyænus, vii. 6, 10.

It is remarkable that among the miracles enumerated by Ktêsias, no mention is made of fire or of the pile of wood kindled: we have the chains of Crœsus miraculously struck off, in the midst of thunder and lightning, but no *fire* mentioned. This is deserving of notice, as illustrating the fact that Ktêsias derived his information from *Persian* narrators, who would not be likely to impute to Cyrus the use of fire for such a purpose. The Persians worshipped fire as a god, and considered it impious to burn a dead body (Herodot. iii. 16). Now Herodotus seems to have heard the story about the burning from Lydian informants (λέγεται ὑπὸ Λυδῶν, Herodot. i. 87). Whether the Lydians regarded fire in the same point of view as the Persians, we do not know; but even if they did, they would not be indisposed to impute to Cyrus an act of gross impiety, just as the Egyptians imputed another act equally gross to Kambysês, which Herodotus himself treats as a falsehood (iii. 16).

The long narrative given by Nikolaus Damaskênus of the treatment of Crœsus by Cyrus, has been supposed by some to have been borrowed from the Lydian historian Xânthus, elder contemporary of Herodotus. But it seems to me a mere compilation, not well put together, from Xenophôn's Cyropædia and from the narrative of Herodotus, perhaps including some particular

was released and well treated by his conqueror, and lived to become the confidential adviser of the latter as well as of his son Kambysês:[1] Ktêsias also acquaints us that a considerable town and territory near Ekbatana, called Barênê, was assigned to him, according to a practice which we shall find not unfrequent with the Persian kings.

The prudent counsel and remarks as to the relations between Persians and Lydians, whereby Crœsus is said by Herodotus to have first earned this favourable treatment, are hardly worth repeating; but the indignant remonstrance sent by Crœsus to the Delphian god is too characteristic to be passed over. He obtained permission from Cyrus to lay upon the holy pavement of the Delphian temple the chains with which he had at first been bound. The Lydian envoys were instructed, after exhibiting to the god these humiliating memorials, to ask whether it was his custom to deceive his benefactors, and whether he was not ashamed to have encouraged the king of Lydia in an enterprise so disastrous? The god, condescending to justify himself by the lips of the priestess, replied — "Not even a god can escape his destiny. Crœsus has suffered for the sin of his fifth ancestor (Gygês), who, conspiring with a woman, slew his master and wrongfully seized the sceptre. Apollo employed all his influence with the Mœræ (Fates) to obtain that this sin might be expiated by the children of Crœsus, and not by Crœsus himself; but the Mœræ would grant nothing more than a postponement of the judgment for three years. Let Crœsus know that Apollo has thus procured for him a reign three years longer than his original destiny," after having tried in vain to rescue him altogether. Moreover he sent that rain which at the critical moment extinguished the burning pile. Nor has Crœsus any right to complain of the prophecy by which he was encouraged to enter on the war; for when the god told him that he would subvert *a great empire*, it

**Remonstrance addressed by Crœsus to the Delphian god.**

incidents out of Xanthus (see Nikol. Damas. Fragm. ed. Orell. p. 57—70, and the Fragments of Xanthus in Didot's Historic. Græcor. Fragm. p. 40).

[1] Justin (i. 7) seems to copy Ktêsias, about the treatment of Crœsus.

[2] Herodot. i. 91. Πρυθυμεομένου δὲ Δοξίεω ὁκως ἂν κατὰ τοὺς παῖδας τοὺς Κροίσου γένοιτο τὸ Σαρδίων πάθος, αἰ μὴ κατ' αὐτὸν Κροῖσον, οὐκ οἷόν τε ἐγένετο παραγαγεῖν Μοίρας· ὅσοι δὲ ἐνέδωκαν αὐταῖ, ἡνύσατο, καὶ ἐχαρί ό οἱ· τρία γὰρ ἔτεα ἐπανεβάλετο τὴν ρ ν ἅλωσιν. Καὶ τοῦτο ἐπιστάσθω Κροῖ ς, ὡς ὕστερον τοῖσι ἔτεσι τούτοισι ἁλοὺς τῆς πεπρωμένης.

was his duty to have again inquired which empire the god meant; and if he neither understood the meaning, nor chose to ask for information, he has himself to blame for the result. Besides, Crœsus neglected the warning given to him, about the acquisition of the Median kingdom by a mule: Cyrus was that mule—son of a Median mother of royal breed, by a Persian father at once of different race and of lower position."

This triumphant justification extorted even from Crœsus himself a full confession, that the sin lay with him, and not with the god.[1] It certainly illustrates in a remarkable manner the theological ideas of the time. It shows us how much, in the mind of Herodotus, the facts of the centuries preceding his own, unrecorded as they were by any contemporary authority, tended to cast themselves into a sort of religious drama; the threads of the historical web being in part put together, in part originally spun, for the purpose of setting forth the religious sentiment and doctrine woven in as a pattern. The Pythian priestess predicts to Gygês that the crime which he had committed in assassinating his master would be expiated by his fifth descendant, though, as Herodotus tells us, no one took any notice of this prophecy until it was at last fulfilled:[2] we see thus the history of the first Mermnad king is made up after the catastrophe of the last. There was something in the main facts of the history of Crœsus profoundly striking to the Greek mind: a king at the summit of wealth and power—pious in the extreme and munificent towards the gods—the first destroyer of Hellenic liberty in Asia—then precipitated, at once and on a sudden, into the abyss of ruin. The sin of the first parent helped much towards the solution of this perplexing problem, as well as to exalt the credit of the oracle, when made to assume the shape of an unnoticed prophecy. In the affecting story (discussed in a former chapter[3]) of Solôn and Crœsus, the Lydian king is punished with an acute domestic affliction because he thought himself the happiest of mankind—the gods not suffering any one to be arrogant except

Successful justification of the oracle.

Fate of Crœsus impressive to the Greek mind.

[1] Herodot. i. 91. Ὁ δὲ ἀκούσας συνέγνω ἑωυτοῦ εἶναι τὴν ἁμαρτάδα, καὶ οὐ τοῦ θεοῦ.

Xenophôn also in the Cyropædia (vii. 2, 16—25) brings Crœsus to the same result of confession and humiliation, though by steps somewhat different.

[2] Herodot. i. 13.

[3] See above, chap. xi. vol. ii. p. 518.

themselves;[1] and the warning of Solôn is made to recur to Crœsus after he has become the prisoner of Cyrus, in the narrative of Herodotus. To the same vein of thought belongs the story, just recounted, of the relations of Crœsus with the Delphian oracle. An account is provided, satisfactory to the religious feelings of the Greeks, how and why he was ruined—but nothing less than the overruling and omnipotent Mœræ could be invoked to explain so stupendous a result. It is rarely that these supreme goddesses —or hyper-goddesses, since the gods themselves must submit to them—are brought into such distinct light and action. Usually they are kept in the dark, or are left to be understood as the unseen stumbling-block in cases of extreme incomprehensibility; and it is difficult clearly to determine (as in the case of some complicated political constitutions) where the Greeks conceived sovereign power to reside, in respect to the government of the world. But here the sovereignty of the Mœræ, and the subordinate agency of the gods, are unequivocally set forth.[2] The

The Mœræ or Fates.

[1] Herodot. vii. 10. οὐ γὰρ ἐᾷ φρονέειν ἄλλον μέγα ὁ θεὸς ἢ ἑωϋτόν.

[2] In the oracle reported in Herodot. vii. 141, as delivered by the Pythian priestess to Athens on occasion of the approach of Xerxês, Zeus is represented in the same supreme position as the present oracle assigns to the Mœræ or Fates: Pallas in vain attempts to propitiate him in favour of Athens, just as in this case Apollo tries to mitigate the Mœræ in respect to Crœsus—

Οὐ δύναται Παλλὰς Δί Ὀλύμπιον ἐξιλάσασθαι,
Αἰσσομένη πολλοῖσι λόγοις καὶ μήτιδι πυκνῇ, &c.

Compare also viii. 109 and ix. 16.

O. Müller (Dissertation on the Eumenides of Æschylus, p. 222, Eng. Transl.) says—"On no occasion does Zeus Sôtêr exert his influence directly, like Apollo, Minerva, and the Erinnyes; but whereas Apollo is prophet and exêgêtês by virtue of wisdom derived from him, and Minerva is indebted to him for her sway over states and assemblies—nay, the very Erinnyes exercise their functions in his name—this Zeus stands always in the background, and has in reality only to settle a conflict existing within himself. For with Æschylus, as with all men of profound feeling among the Greeks from the earliest times, Jupiter is the only real god in the higher sense of the word. Although he is in the spirit of ancient theology a generated god arisen out of an imperfect state of things, and not produced till the third stage of a development of nature—still he is, at the time we are speaking of, the spirit that pervades and governs the universe."

To the same purpose Klausen expresses himself (Theologumena Æschyli, p. 6—69).

It is perfectly true that many passages may be produced from Greek authors which ascribe to Zeus the supreme power here noted. But it is equally true that this conception is not uniformly adhered to, and that sometimes the Fates or Mœræ are represented as supreme; occasionally represented as the stronger and Zeus as the weaker (Promêtheus, 515). The whole tenor of the Promêtheus of Æschylus, in fact, brings out the conception of a Zeus τύραννος—whose power is not supreme, even for the time; and is not destined to continue permanently even at its existing height. The explanations given by Klausen of this drama appear to me incorrect; nor do I understand how it is to be reconciled with the above passage quoted from O. Müller.

The two oracles here cited from

gods are still extremely powerful, because the Mœræ comply with their requests up to a certain point, not thinking it proper to be wholly inexorable; but their compliance is carried no farther than they themselves choose; nor would they, even in deference to Apollo,[1] alter the original sentence of punishment for the sin of Gygês in the person of his fifth descendant—a sentence moreover which Apollo himself had formally prophesied shortly after the sin was committed; so that, if the Mœræ had listened to his intercession on behalf of Crœsus, his own prophetic credit would have been endangered. Their unalterable resolution has predetermined the ruin of Crœsus, and the grandeur of the event is manifested by the circumstance, that even Apollo himself cannot prevail upon them to alter it, or to grant more than a three years' respite. The religious element must here be viewed as giving the form—the historical element as giving the matter only, and not the whole matter—of the story. These two elements will be found conjoined more or less throughout most of the history of Herodotus, though as we descend to later times we shall find the latter element in constantly increasing proportion. His conception of history is extremely different from that of Thucydidês, who lays down to himself the true scheme and purpose of the historian, common to him with the philosopher—to recount and interpret the past, as a rational aid towards prevision of the future.[2]

The destruction of the Lydian monarchy, and the establish-

Herodotus exhibit plainly the fluctuation of Greek opinion on this subject: in the one, the supreme determination, and the inexorability which accompanies it, are ascribed to Zeus—in the other, to the Mœræ. This double point of view adapted itself to different occasions, and served as a help for the interpretation of different events. Zeus was supposed to have certain sympathies for human beings; misfortunes happened to various men which he not only did not wish to bring on, but would have been disposed to avert; here the Mœræ, who had no sympathies, were introduced as an explanatory cause, tacitly implied as overruling Zeus. "Cum Furiis Æschylus Parcas tantum non ubique conjungit," says Klausen (Theol. Æsch. p. 39): and this entire absence of human sympathies constitutes the common point of both—that in which the Mœræ and the Erinnyes differ from all the other gods—*περφρικα τὰν ὠλεσίοικον θεὰν, οὐ θεοῖς ὁμοίαν* (Æschyl. Sept. ad Theb. 720): compare Eumenid. 961, 172, and indeed the general strain of that fearful tragedy.

In Æschylus, as in Herodotus, Apollo is represented as exercising persuasive powers over the Mœræ (Eumenid. 724)—*Μοίρας ἔπεισας ἀφθίτους θεῖναι βροτούς.*

[1] The language of Herodotus deserves attention: Apollo tells Crœsus—"I applied to the Mœræ to get the execution of the judgment postponed from your time to that of your children—but I could not prevail upon them; but as much as they would yield *of their own accord*, I procured for you *ὅσον δὲ ἐνέδωκαν αὐταί, ἐχαρίσατό-οι*—i. 91).

[2] Thucyd. i. 22.

ment of the Persians at Sardis—an event pregnant with consequences to Hellas generally—took place in 546 B.C.[1] Sorely did the Ionic Greeks now repent that they had rejected the propositions made to them by Cyrus for revolting from Crœsus—though at the time when these propositions were made, it would have been highly imprudent to listen to them, since the Lydian power might reasonably be looked upon as the stronger. As soon as Sardis had fallen, they sent envoys to the conqueror entreating that they might be enrolled as his tributaries, on the footing which they had occupied under Crœsus. The reply was a stern and angry refusal, with the exception of the Milesians, to whom the terms which they asked were granted:[2] why this favourable exception was extended to them, we do not know.

B.C. 546.

State of the Asiatic Greeks after the conquest of Lydia by Cyrus.

The other continental Ionians and Æolians (exclusive of Milêtus, and exclusive also of the insular cities which the Persians had no means of attacking), seized with alarm, began to put themselves in a condition of defence. It seems that the Lydian king had caused their fortifications to be wholly or partially dismantled, for we are told that they now began to erect walls; and the Phôkæans especially devoted to that purpose a present which they had received from the Iberian Arganthônius, king of Tartêssus. Besides thus strengthening their own cities, they thought it advisable to send a joint embassy entreating aid from Sparta. They doubtless were not unapprised that the Spartans had actually equipped an army for the support of Crœsus. Their deputies went to Sparta, where the

They apply in vain to Sparta for aid.

[1] This important date depends upon the evidence of Solinus (Polyhistor. i. 112) and Sosikratês (ap. Diog. Laërt. i. 95): see Mr. Clinton's Fasti Hellen. ad ann. 546, and his Appendix, ch. 17, upon the Lydian kings.

Mr. Clinton and most of the chronologists accept the date without hesitation, but Volney (Recherches sur l'Histoire Ancienne, vol. i. p. 306—308; Chronologie des Rois Lydiens) rejects it altogether; considering the capture of Sardis to have occurred in 557 B.C., and the reign of Crœsus to have begun in 571 B.C. He treats very contemptuously the authority of Solinus and Sosikratês, and has an elaborate argumentation to prove that the date which he adopts is borne out by Herodotus. This latter does not appear to me at all satisfactory; I adopt the date of Solinus and Sosikratês (though agreeing with Volney that such positive authority is not very considerable), because there is nothing to contradict them, and because the date which they give seems in consonance with the stream of the history.

Volney's arguments suppose in the mind of Herodotus a degree of chronological precision altogether unreasonable, in reference to events anterior to contemporary records. He (like other chronologists) exhausts his ingenuity to find a proper point of historical time for the supposed conversation between Solôn and Crœsus (p. 320).

[2] Herodot. i. 141.

Phôkæan Pythermus, appointed by the rest to be spokesman, clothing himself in a purple robe[1] in order to attract the largest audience possible, set forth their pressing need of succour against the impending danger. The Lacedæmonians refused the prayer; nevertheless they despatched to Phôkæa some commissioners to investigate the state of affairs—who, perhaps persuaded by the Phôkæans, sent Lakrinês, one of their number, to the conqueror at Sardis, to warn him that he should not lay hands on any city of Hellas, for the Lacedæmonians would not permit it. "Who are these Lacedæmonians? (inquired Cyrus from some Greeks who stood near him)—how many are there of them, that they venture to send me such a notice?" Having received the answer, wherein it was stated that the Lacedæmonians had a city and a regular market at Sparta, he exclaimed—"I have never yet been afraid of men like these, who have a set place in the middle of their city, where they meet to cheat one another and forswear themselves. If I live they shall have troubles of their own to talk about, apart from the Ionians." To buy or sell appeared to the Persians a contemptible practice: for they carried out consistently one step farther, the principle upon which even many able Greeks condemned the lending of money on interest; and the speech of Cyrus was intended as a covert reproach on Grecian habits generally.[2]

This blank menace of Lakrinês, an insulting provocation to the enemy rather than a real support to the distressed, was the only benefit which the Ionic Greeks derived from Sparta. They were left to defend themselves as best they could against the conqueror, who presently however quitted Sardis to prosecute in person his conquests in the East, leaving the Persian Tabalus with a garrison in the citadel, but consigning the large treasure captured, with authority over the Lydian population, to the Lydian Paktyas. As he carried away Crœsus along with him, he probably considered himself sure of the fidelity of those Lydians whom the deposed monarch recommended. But he had not yet arrived at his own capital, when he received the intelligence that Paktyas had revolted, arming the Lydian population, and employing the treasure in his charge to

Cyrus quits Sardis—revolt of the Lydians suppressed.

[1] Herodot. i. 152. The purple garment, so attractive a spectacle amid the plain clothing universal at Sparta, marks the contrast between Asiatic and European Greece.

[2] Herodot. i. 153. ταῦτα ἐς τοὺς πάντας Ἕλληνας ἀπέῤῥιψε ὁ Κῦρος τὰ ἔπεα, &c.

hire fresh troops. On hearing this news, Cyrus addressed himself to Crœsus (according to Herodotus) in terms of much wrath against the Lydians, and even intimated that he should be compelled to sell them all as slaves. Upon which Crœsus, full of alarm for his people, contended strenuously that Paktyas alone was in fault and deserving of punishment; but he at the same time advised Cyrus to disarm the Lydian population, and to enforce upon them both effeminate attire and habits of playing on the harp and shopkeeping. "By this process (he said) you will soon see them become women instead of men."[1] This suggestion is said to have been accepted by Cyrus, and executed by his general Mazarês. The conversation here reported, and the deliberate plan for enervating the Lydian character supposed to be pursued by Cyrus, is evidently an hypothesis imagined by some of the contemporaries or predecessors of Herodotus, to explain the contrast between the Lydians whom they saw before them, after two or three generations of slavery, and the old irresistible horsemen of whom they heard in fame, at the time when Crœsus was lord from the Halys to the Ægean Sea.

The Persian general Mazarês attacks Ionia—the Lydian Paktyas.

To return to Paktyas—he had commenced his revolt, come down to the sea-coast, and employed the treasures of Sardis in levying a Grecian mercenary force, with which he invested the place and blocked up the governor Tabalus. But he manifested no courage worthy of so dangerous an enterprise; for no sooner had he heard that the Median general Mazarês was approaching at the head of an army despatched by Cyrus against him, than he disbanded his force and fled to Kymê for protection as a suppliant. Presently arrived a menacing summons from Mazarês, demanding that he should be given up forthwith, which plunged the Kymæans into profound dismay. The idea of giving up a suppliant to destruction was shocking to Grecian sentiment. They sent to solicit advice from the holy temple of Apollo at Branchidæ near Milêtus; and the reply directed that Paktyas should be surrendered. Nevertheless so ignominious did such a surrender appear, that Aristodikus and some other Kymæan citizens denounced the messengers as liars, and required that a more trustworthy deputation should be sent to consult the god. Aristodikus

[1] Herodot. i. 155.

himself, forming one of the second body, stated the perplexity to the oracle, and received a repetition of the same answer; whereupon he proceeded to rob the birds'-nests which existed in abundance in and about the temple. A voice from the inner oracular chamber speedily arrested him, exclaiming—"Most impious of men, how darest thou to do such things? Wilt thou snatch my suppliants from the temple itself?" Unabashed by the rebuke, Aristodikus replied—"Master, thus dost *thou* help suppliants thyself: and dost thou command the Kymæans to give up a suppliant?" "Yes, I do command it[1] (rejoined the god forthwith), in order that the crime may bring destruction upon you the sooner, and that you may not in future come to consult the oracle upon the surrender of suppliants."

The ingenuity of Aristodikus thus completely nullified the oracular response, and left the Kymæans in their original perplexity. Not choosing to surrender Paktyas, nor daring to protect him against a besieging army, they sent him away to Mitylênê, whither the envoys of Mazarês followed and demanded him; offering a reward so considerable that the Kymæans became fearful of trusting them, and again conveyed away the suppliant to Chios, where he took refuge in the temple of Athênê Poliuchus. But here again the pursuers followed. The Chians were persuaded to drag him from the temple and surrender him, on consideration of receiving the territory of Atarneus (a district on the continent over against the island of Lesbos) as purchase-money. Paktyas was thus seized and sent prisoner to Cyrus, who had given the most express orders for this capture: hence the unusual intensity of the pursuit. But it appears that the territory of Atarneus was considered as having been ignominiously acquired by the Chians: none even of their own citizens would employ any article of its produce for holy or sacrificial purposes.[2]

[1] Herodot. i. 159.

[2] Herodot. i. 160. The short fragment from Charôn of Lampsakus, which Plutarch (De Malignitat. Herod. p. 859) cites here, in support of one among his many unjust censures on Herodotus, is noway inconsistent with the statement of the latter, but rather tends to confirm it.

In writing this treatise on the alleged ill-temper of Herodotus, we see that Plutarch had before him the history of Charôn of Lampsakus, more ancient by one generation than the historian whom he was assailing, and also belonging to Asiatic Greece. Of course it suited the purpose of his work to produce all the contradictions to Herodotus which he could find in Charôn: the fact that he has produced none of any moment, tends to strengthen our faith in the historian of Halikarnassus, and to show that in the main his narrative was in accordance with that of Charôn.

Harpagus succeeds Mazarês—conquest of Ionia by the Persians.

Mazarês next proceeded to the attack and conquest of the Greeks on the coast: an enterprise which, since he soon died of illness, was completed by his successor Harpagus. The towns assailed successively made a gallant but ineffectual resistance. The Persian general by his numbers drove the defenders within their walls, against which he piled up mounds of earth, so as either to carry the place by storm or to compel surrender. All of them were reduced one after the other. With all, the terms of subjection were doubtless harder than those which had been imposed upon them by Crœsus, because Cyrus had already refused to grant these terms to them, with the single exception of Milêtus, and because they had since given additional offence by aiding the revolt of Paktyas. The inhabitants of Priênê were sold into slavery; they were the first assailed by Mazarês, and had perhaps been especially forward in the attack made by Paktyas on Sardis.[1]

Fate of Phôkæa.

Among these unfortunate towns thus changing their master and passing into a harsher subjection, two deserve especial notice—Teôs and Phôkæa. The citizens of the former, so soon as the mound around their walls had rendered farther resistance impossible, embarked and emigrated, some to Thrace, where they founded Abdêra—others to the Cimmerian Bosphorus, where they planted Phanagoria: a portion of them however must have remained to take the chances of subjection, since the town appears in after-times still peopled and still Hellenic.[2]

The fate of Phôkæa, similar in the main, is given to us with more striking circumstances of detail, and becomes the more interesting, since the enterprising mariners who inhabited it had been the torch-bearers of Grecian geographical discovery in the west. I have already described their adventurous exploring voyages of former days into the interior of the Adriatic, and along the whole northern and western coasts of the Mediterranean as far as Tartêssus (the region around and adjoining to Cadiz)—together with the favourable reception given to them by old Arganthônius, king of the country, who invited them to immigrate in a body to his kingdom, offering them the choice of any site

1 Herodot. i. 161—169.

2 Herodot. i. 168: Skymnus Chius, Fragm. v. 153; Dionys. Perieg. v. 553.

which they might desire. His invitation was declined, though probably the Phôkæans may have subsequently regretted the refusal; and he then manifested his goodwill towards them by a large present to defray the expense of constructing fortifications round their town.[1] The walls, erected in part by this aid, were both extensive and well built. Yet they could not hinder Harpagus from raising his mounds of earth up against them, while he was politic enough at the same time to tempt them with offers of a moderate capitulation; requiring only that they should breach their walls in one place by pulling down one of the towers, and consecrate one building in the interior of the town as a token of subjection. To accept these terms was to submit themselves to the discretion of the besieger, for there could be no security that they would be observed. The Phôkæans, while they asked for one day to deliberate upon their reply, entreated that during that day Harpagus should withdraw his troops

[1] Herodot. i. 163. Ὁ δὲ πυθόμενος παρ' αὐτῶν τὸν Μῆδον ὡς αὔξοιτο, ἐδίδου σφι χρήματα τείχος περιβαλέσθαι τὴν πόλιν.

I do not understand why the commentators debate what or who is meant by τὸν Μῆδον: it plainly means the Median or Persian power generally; but the chronological difficulty is a real one, if we are to suppose that there was time between the first alarm conceived of the Median power by the Ionians, and the siege of Phôkæa by Harpagus, to inform Arganthônius of the circumstances, and to procure from him this large aid as well as to build the fortifications. The Ionic Greeks neither actually did conceive, nor had reason to conceive, any alarm respecting Persian power, until the arrival of Cyrus before Sardis; and within a month from that time Sardis was in his possession. If we are to suppose communication with Arganthônius grounded upon this circumstance, at the distance of Tartêssus and under the circumstances of ancient navigation, we must necessarily imagine also that the attack made by Harpagus upon Phôkæa (which city he assailed before any of the rest) was postponed for at least two or three years. Such postponement is not wholly impossible, yet it is not in the spirit of the Herodotean narrative, nor do I think it likely. It is much more probable that the informants of Herodotus made a slip in chronology, and ascribed the donations of Arganthônius to a motive which did not really dictate them.

As to the fortifications (which Phôkæa and the other Ionic cities are reported to have erected after the conquest of Sardis by the Persians), the case may stand thus. While these cities were all independent, before they were first conquered by Crœsus, they must undoubtedly have had fortifications. When Crœsus conquered them, he directed the demolition of the fortifications; but demolition does not necessarily mean pulling down the entire walls: when one or a few breaches are made, the city is laid open, and the purpose of Crœsus would thus be answered. Such may well have been the state of the Ionian cities at the time when they first thought it necessary to provide defences against the Persians at Sardis: they repaired and perfected the breached fortifications.

The conjecture of Larcher (see the Notes both of Larcher and Wesseling) —τὸν Λυδόν instead of τὸν Μῆδον—is not an unreasonable one, if it had any authority: the donation of Arganthônius would then be transferred to the period anterior to the Lydian conquest: it would get rid of the chronological difficulty above adverted to, but it would introduce some new awkwardness into the narrative.

altogether from the walls. With this demand the latter complied, intimating at the same time that he saw clearly through the meaning of it. The Phôkæans, having determined that the inevitable servitude impending over their town should not be shared by its inhabitants, employed their day of grace in preparation for collective exile, putting on shipboard their wives and children as well as their furniture and the moveable decorations of their temples. They then set sail for Chios, leaving to the conqueror a deserted town for the occupation of a Persian garrison.[1]

Emigration of the Phôkæans, vowed by all, executed only by one-half.

It appears that the fugitives were not very kindly received at Chios. At least when they made a proposition for purchasing from the Chians the neighbouring islands of Œnussæ as a permanent abode, the latter were induced to refuse by apprehensions of commercial rivalry. It was necessary to look farther for a settlement; while Arganthônius, their protector, being now dead, Tartêssus was no longer inviting. Twenty years before, however, the colony of Alalia in the island of Corsica had been founded from Phôkæa by the direction of the oracle, and thither the general body of Phôkæans now resolved to repair. Having prepared their ships for this distant voyage, they first sailed back to Phôkæa, surprised the Persian garrison whom Harpagus had left in the town, and slew them. They then sunk in the harbour a great lump of iron, binding themselves by a solemn and unanimous oath never again to see Phôkæa until that iron should come up to the surface. Nevertheless, in spite of the oath, the voyage of exile had been scarcely begun when more than half of them repented of having so bound themselves—and became home-sick.[2] They broke their vow and returned to Phôkæa. Yet since Herodotus does not mention any divine judgment as having been consequent on the perjury, we may perhaps suspect that some grey-headed citizen, to whom transportation to Corsica might be little less than a sentence of death, both persuaded

[1] Herodot. i. 164.

[2] Herodot. i. 165. ὑπερημίσεας τῶν ἀστῶν ἔλαβε πόθος τε καὶ οἶκτος τῆς πόλιος καὶ τῶν ἠθέων τῆς χώρης. ψευδόρκιοί τε γενόμενοι, &c. The colloquial term which I have ventured to place in the text expresses exactly, as well as briefly, the meaning of the historian. A public oath, taken by most of the Greek cities with similar ceremony of lumps of iron thrown into the sea, is mentioned in Plutarch, Aristid. c. 25.

himself, and certified to his companions, that he had seen the sunken lump of iron raised up and floating for a while buoyant upon the waves. Harpagus must have been induced to pardon the previous slaughter of his Persian garrison, or at least to believe that it had been done by those Phôkæans who still persisted in exile. He wanted tribute-paying subjects, not an empty military post, and the repentant home-seekers were allowed to number themselves among the slaves of the Great King.

Meanwhile the smaller but more resolute half of the Phôkæans executed their voyage to Alalia in Corsica, with their wives and children, in sixty pentekonters or armed ships, and established themselves along with the previous settlers. They remained there for five years,[1] during which time their indiscriminate piracies had become so intolerable (even down to this time, piracy committed against a foreign vessel seems to have been practised frequently, and without much disrepute), that both the Tyrrhenian sea-ports along the Mediterranean coast of Italy, and the Carthaginians, united to put them down. There subsisted particular treaties between these two, for the regulation of the commercial intercourse between Africa and Italy, of which the ancient treaty preserved by Polybius between Rome and Carthage (made in 509 B.C.) may be considered as a specimen.[2] Sixty Carthaginian and as many Tuscan ships, attacking the sixty Phôkæan ships near Alalia, destroyed forty of them, yet not without such severe loss to themselves that the victory was said to be on the side of the latter; who, however, in spite of this Kadmeian victory (so a battle was denominated in which the victors lost more than the vanquished), were compelled to carry back their remaining twenty vessels to Alalia and to retire with their wives and families, in so far as room could be found for them, to Rhegium. At last these unhappy exiles found a permanent home by establishing the new settlement of Elea or Velia in the Gulf of Policastro, on the Italian coast (then called Œnôtrian) southward from Poseidônia or Pæstum. It is probable that they were here joined by other exiles from Ionia, in particular by the Kolophonian

Phôkæan colony first at Alalia, then at Elea.

[1] Herodot. i. 166.

[2] Aristot. Polit. iii. 5, 11; Polyb. iii. 22.

philosopher and poet Xenophanês, from whom what was afterwards called the Eleatic school of philosophy, distinguished both for bold consistency and dialectic acuteness, took its rise. The Phôkæan captives, taken prisoners in the naval combat by Tyrrhenians and Carthaginians, were stoned to death. But a divine judgment overtook the Tyrrhenian town of Agylla in consequence of this cruelty; and even in the time of Herodotus, a century afterwards, the Agyllæans were still expiating the sin by a periodical solemnity and agôn, pursuant to the penalty which the Delphian oracle had imposed upon them.[1]

Such was the fate of the Phôkæan exiles, while their brethren at home remained as subjects of Harpagus, in common with all the other Ionic and Æolic Greeks, except Samos and Milêtus. For even the insular inhabitants of Lesbos and Chios, though not assailable by sea, since the Persians had no fleet, thought it better to renounce their independence and enrol themselves as Persian subjects—both of them possessing strips of the mainland which they were unable to protect otherwise. Samos, on the other hand, maintained its independence, and even reached, shortly after this period, under the despotism of Polykratês, a higher degree of power than ever: perhaps the humiliation of the other maritime Greeks around may have rather favoured the ambition of this unscrupulous prince, to whom I shall revert presently. But we may readily conceive that the public solemnities in which the Ionic Greeks intermingled, in place of those gay and richly-decked crowds which the Homeric hymn describes in the preceding century as assembled at Dêlos, presented scenes of marked despondency. One of their wisest men, indeed, Bias of Priênê, went so far as to propose, at the Pan-Ionic festival, a collective emigration of the entire population of the Ionic towns to the island of Sardinia. Nothing like freedom (he urged) was now open to them in Asia; but in Sardinia, one great Pan-Ionic city might be formed, which would not only be free herself, but mistress of her neighbours. The proposition found no favour; the reason of which is sufficiently evident from the narrative just given respecting the unconquerable local attachment on the part of the Phôkæan

**Proposition of Bias for a Pan-Ionic emigration not adopted.**

[1] Herodot. i. 167.

majority. But Herodotus bestows upon it the most unqualified commendation and regrets that it was not acted upon.[1] Had such been the case, the subsequent history of Carthage, Sicily, and even Rome might have been sensibly altered.

Thus subdued by Harpagus, the Ionic and Æolic Greeks were employed as auxiliaries to him in the conquest of the south-western inhabitants of Asia Minor—Karians, Kaunians, Lykians, and Doric Greeks of Knidus and Halikarnassus. Of the fate of the latter town, Herodotus tells us nothing, though it was his native place. The inhabitants of Knidus, a place situated on a long outlying tongue of land, at first tried to cut through the narrow isthmus which joined them to the continent, but abandoned the attempt with a facility which Herodotus explains by referring it to a prohibition of the oracle.[2] Neither Karians nor Kaunians offered any serious resistance. The Lykians only, in their chief town Xanthus, made a desperate defence. Having in vain tried to repel the assailants in the open field, and finding themselves blocked up in their city, they set fire to it with their own hands; consuming in the flames their women, children, and servants, while the armed citizens marched out and perished to a man in combat with the enemy.[3] Such an act of brave and even ferocious despair is not in the Grecian character. In recounting, however, the languid defence and easy submission of the Greeks of Knidus, it may surprise us to call to mind that they were Dorians and colonists from Sparta. The want of steadfast courage, often imputed to Ionic Greeks as compared to Dorian, ought properly to be charged on Asiatic Greeks as compared with European; or rather upon that mixture of indigenous with Hellenic population, which all the Asiatic colonies, in common with most of the other colonies, presented, and which in Halikarnassus was particularly remarkable; for it seems to have been half Karian, half Dorian, and was even governed by a line of Karian despots.

Entire conquest of Asia Minor by the Persians.

[1] Herodot. i. 170. Πυνθάνομαι γνώμην Βίαντα ἄνδρα Πριηνέα ἀποδέξασθαι Ἴωσι χρησιμωτάτην, τῇ εἰ ἐπείθοντο, παρεῖχε ἂν σφι εὐδαιμονέειν Ἑλλήνων μάλιστα.

[2] Herodot. i. 174.

[3] Herodot. i. 176 The whole population of Xanthus perished, except eighty families accidentally absent: the subsequent occupants of the town were recruited from strangers. Nearly five centuries afterwards, their descendants in the same city slew themselves in the like desperate and tragical manner, to avoid surrendering to the Roman army under Marcus Brutus (Plutarch, Brutus, c. 31).

Harpagus and the Persians thus mastered, without any considerable resistance, the western and southern portions of Asia Minor; probably also, though we have no direct account of it, the entire territory within the Halys which had before been ruled by Crœsus. The tributes of the conquered Greeks were transmitted to Ekbatana instead of to Sardis. While Harpagus was thus employed, Cyrus himself had been making still more extensive conquests in Upper Asia and Assyria, of which I shall speak in the coming chapter.

# CHAPTER XXXIII

## GROWTH OF THE PERSIAN EMPIRE.

IN the preceding chapter an account has been given, the best which we can pick out from Herodotus, of the steps by which the Asiatic Greeks became subject to Persia. If his narrative is meagre, on a matter which vitally concerned not only so many of his brother Greeks, but even his own native city, we can hardly expect that he should tell us much respecting the other conquests of Cyrus. He seems to withhold intentionally various details which had come to his knowledge, and merely intimates in general terms that while Harpagus was engaged on the coast of the Ægean, Cyrus himself assailed and subdued all the nations of Upper Asia, "not omitting any one of them".[1] He alludes to the Baktrians and the Sakæ,[2] who are also named by Ktêsias as having become subject partly by force, partly by capitulation. But he deems only two of the exploits of Cyrus worthy of special notice—the conquest of Babylon, and the final expedition against the Massagetæ. In the short abstract which we now possess of the lost work of Ktêsias, no mention appears of the important conquest of Babylon. His narrative, indeed, as far as the abstract enables us to follow it, diverges materially from that of Herodotus, and must have been founded on data altogether different.

Conquests of Cyrus in Asia.

"I shall mention (says Herodotus)[3] those conquests which gave Cyrus most trouble, and are most memorable: after he had subdued all the rest of the continent, he attacked the Assyrians." Those who recollect the description of

His attack of Babylon.

[1] Herodot. i. 177.

[2] Herodot. i. 153.

[3] Herodot. i. 177. τὰ δὲ οἱ πάρεσχε πόνον τε πλεῖστον, καὶ ἀξιαπηγητοτατά ἐστι, τούτων ἐπιμνήσομαι.

Babylon and its surrounding territory, as given in a former chapter, will not be surprised to learn that the capture of it gave the Persian aggressor much trouble. Their only surprise will be, how it could ever have been taken at all—or indeed how a hostile army could have even reached it. Herodotus informs us that the Babylonian queen Nitôkris (mother of that very Labynêtus who was king when Cyrus attacked the place), apprehensive of invasion from the Medes after their capture of Nineveh, had executed many laborious works near the Euphratês for the purpose of obstructing their approach. Moreover there existed what was called the wall of Media (probably built by her, but certainly built prior to the Persian conquest), one hundred feet high and twenty feet thick,[1] across the entire space of seventy-five miles which joined the Tigris with one of the canals of the Euphratês: while the canals themselves, as we may see by the march of the Ten Thousand Greeks after the battle of Kunaxa, presented means of defence altogether insuperable by a rude army such as that of the Persians. On the east, the territory of Babylonia was defended by the Tigris, which cannot be forded lower than the ancient Nineveh or the modern Mosul.[2] In addition to these ramparts, natural as well as artificial, to protect the territory—populous,

[1] See Xenophôn, Anabas. i. 7, 15; ii. 4, 12. For the inextricable difficulties in which the Ten Thousand Greeks were involved, after the battle of Kunaxa, and the insurmountable obstacles which impeded their march, assuming any resisting force whatever, see Xenoph. Anab. ii. 1, 11; ii. 2, 3; ii. 3, 10; ii. 4, 12, 13. These obstacles doubtless served as a protection to them against attack, not less than as an impediment to their advance; and the well-supplied villages enabled them to obtain plenty of provisions: hence the anxiety of the Great King to help them across the Tigris out of Babylonia. But it is not easy to see how, in the face of such difficulties, any invading army could reach Babylon.

Ritter represents the wall of Media as having reached across from the Euphratês to the Tigris at the point where they come nearest together, about 200 stadia or twenty-five miles across. But it is nowhere stated, so far as I can find, that this wall reached to the Euphratês—still less that its length was 200 stadia, for the passages of Strabo cited by Ritter do not prove either point (ii. 80; xi. 529). And Xenophôn (ii. 4, 12) gives the length of the wall as I have stated it in the text, = 20 parasangs = 600 stadia = 75 miles.

The passage of the Anabasis (i. 7, 15) seems to connect the Median wall with the canals, and not with the river Euphratês. The narrative of Herodotus (as I have remarked in a former chapter) leads us to suppose that he descended that river to Babylon; and if we suppose that the wall did not reach the Euphratês, this would afford some reason why he makes no mention of it. See Ritter, West-Asien, b. iii., Abtheilung iii., Abschn. i., sect. 29, p. 19—22.

[2] Ὁ Τίγρης μέγας τε καὶ οὐδαμοῦ διαβατὸς ἐς τε ἐπὶ τὴν ἐκβολήν (Arrian, vii. 7, 7). By which he means, that it is not fordable below the ancient Nineveh or Mosul; for a little above that spot, Alexander himself forded it with his army, a few days before the battle of Arbêla—not without very great difficulty (Arrian. iii. 7, 8; Diodôr. xvii. 55).

cultivated, productive, and offering every motive to its inhabitants to resist even the entrance of an enemy—we are told that the Babylonians were so thoroughly prepared for the inroad of Cyrus that they had accumulated within their walls a store of provisions for many years. Strange as it may seem, we must suppose that the king of Babylon, after all the cost and labour spent in providing defences for the territory, voluntarily neglected to avail himself of them, suffered the invader to tread down the fertile Babylonia without resistance, and merely drew out the citizens to oppose him when he arrived under the walls of the city—if the statement of Herodotus is correct.[1] And we may illustrate this unaccountable omission by that which we know to have happened in the march of the younger Cyrus to Kunaxa against his brother Artaxerxês Mnêmôn. The latter had caused to be dug, expressly in preparation for this invasion, a broad and deep ditch (thirty feet wide and eight feet deep) from the wall of Media to the river Euphratês, a distance of twelve parasangs or forty-five English miles, leaving only a passage of twenty feet broad close alongside of the river. Yet when the invading army arrived at this important pass, they found not a man there to defend it, and all of them marched without resistance through the narrow inlet. Cyrus the younger, who had up to that moment felt assured that his brother would fight, now supposed that he had given up the idea of defending Babylon:[2] instead of which, two days afterwards, Artaxerxês attacked him on an open plain of ground where there was no advantage of position on either side; though the invaders were taken rather unawares in consequence of their extreme confidence arising from recent unopposed entrance within the artificial ditch. This anecdote is the more valuable as an illustration, because all its circumstances are transmitted to us by a discerning eye-witness. And both the two incidents here brought into comparison demonstrate the recklessness, changeful-

Difficult approach to Babylon —no resistance made to the invaders.

1 Herodot. i. 190. ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐγένετο ἐλαύνων ἀγχοῦ τῆς πόλιος, συνέβαλόν τε οἱ Βαβυλώνιοι, καὶ ἐσσωθέντες τῇ μάχῃ, κατειλήθησαν ἐς τὸ ἄστυ.

Just as if Babylon was as easy to be approached as Sardis. About the provisions, οἷά τε ἐπισταμένοι ἔτι πρότερον τὸν Κῦρον οὐκ ἀτρεμίζοντα, ἀλλ' ὁρέοντες αὐτὸν παντὶ ὁμοίως ἔθνεϊ ἐπιχειρέοντα, προεσάξαντο σίτια ἐτέων κάρτα πολλῶν.

2 Xenophôn, Anabas. i. 7, 14—20; Diodôr. xiv. 22; Plutarch, Artaxerxês, c. 7. I follow Xenophôn without hesitation, where he differs from these two latter.

ness, and incapacity of calculation, belonging to the Asiatic mind of that day, as well as the great command of hands possessed by these kings, and their prodigal waste of human labour.[1] We shall see, as we advance in this history, farther evidences of the same attributes, which it is essential to bear in mind, for the purpose of appreciating both Grecian dealing with Asiatics, and the comparative absence of such defects in the Grecian character. Vast walls and deep ditches are an inestimable aid to a brave and well-commanded garrison; but they cannot be made entirely to supply the want of bravery and intelligence.

Cyrus distributes the river Gyndês into many channels.

In whatever manner the difficulties of approaching Babylon may have been overcome, the fact that they were overcome by Cyrus is certain. On first setting out for this conquest, he was about to cross the river Gyndês (one of the affluents from the East which joins the Tigris near the modern Bagdad, and along which lay the high road crossing the pass of Mount Zagros from Babylon to Ekbatana), when one of the sacred white horses, which accompanied him, entered the river in pure wantonness and tried to cross it by himself.[2] The Gyndês resented this insult and the horse was drowned: upon which Cyrus swore in his wrath that he would so break the strength of the river as that women in future should pass it without wetting their knees. Accordingly he employed his entire army, during the whole summer season, in digging three hundred and sixty artificial channels to disseminate the unity of the stream. Such, according to Herodotus, was the incident which postponed for one year the fall of the great Babylon. But in the next spring Cyrus and his army were before the walls, after having defeated and driven in the population who came out to fight. These walls were artificial mountains (three hundred feet high, seventy-five feet thick, and forming a square of fifteen miles to each side), within which the besieged defied attack, and even blockade, having previously stored up several years' provision. Through the midst of the town, however, flowed the Euphratês. That river, which had

1 Xenophôn, Cyropæd. iii. 3, 26, about the barbaric kings. τῶν τις ἱρῶν ἵππων τῶν λευκῶν ὑπὸ ὕβριος ἐσβὰς ἐς τὸν ποταμὸν, διαβαίνειν ἐπειρᾶτο. . . . Καρτα τε ἐχαλέπαινε τῇ πολυχειρίᾳ of the barbaric

2 Herodot. i. 189—202. ἐνθαῦτά οἱ τῷ ποταμῷ ὁ Κῦρος τοῦτο ὑβρίσαντι, &c.

been so laboriously trained to serve for protection, trade, and sustenance to the Babylonians, was now made the avenue of their ruin. Having left a detachment of his army at the two points where the Euphratês enters and quits the city, Cyrus retired with the remainder to the higher part of its course, where an ancient Babylonian queen had prepared one of the great lateral reservoirs for carrying off in case of need the superfluity of its water. Near this point Cyrus caused another reservoir and another canal of communication to be dug, by means of which he drew off the water of the Euphratês to such a degree that it became not above the height of a man's thigh. The period chosen was that of a great Babylonian festival, when the whole population were engaged in amusement and revelry. The Persian troops left near the town, watching their opportunity, entered from both sides along the bed of the river, and took it by surprise with scarcely any resistance. At no other time, except during a festival, could they have done this (says Herodotus) had the river been ever so low; for both banks throughout the whole length of the town were provided with quays, with continuous walls, and with gates at the end of every street which led down to the river at right angles; so that if the population had not been disqualified by the influences of the moment, they would have caught the assailants in the bed of the river "as in a trap," and overwhelmed them from the walls alongside. Within a square of fifteen miles to each side, we are not surprised to hear that both the extremities were already in the power of the besiegers before the central population heard of it, and while they were yet absorbed in unconscious festivity.[1]

**He takes Babylon, by drawing off for a time the waters of the Euphratês.**

[1] Herodot. i. 191. This latter portion of the story, if we may judge from the expression of Herodotus, seems to excite more doubt in his mind than all the rest, for he thinks it necessary to add, "as the residents at Babylon say," ὡς λέγεται ὑπὸ τῶν ταύτῃ οἰκημένων. Yet if we assume the size of the place to be what he has affirmed, there seems nothing remarkable in the fact that the people in the centre did not at once hear of the capture; for the first business of the assailants would be to possess themselves of the walls and gates. It is a lively illustration of prodigious magnitude, and as such it is given by Aristotle (Polit. iii. 1, 12); who however exaggerates it by giving as a report that the inhabitants in the centre did not hear of the capture until the third day. No such exaggeration as this appears in Herodotus.

Xenophôn, in the Cyropædia (vii. 5, 7—18), following the story that Cyrus drained off the Euphratês, represents it as effected in a manner differing from Herodotus. According to him, Cyrus dug two vast and deep ditches, one on each side round the town, from the river above the town to the river

Such is the account given by Herodotus of the circumstances which placed Babylon—the greatest city of Western Asia—in the power of the Persians. To what extent the information communicated to him was incorrect or exaggerated, we cannot now decide. The way in which the city was treated would lead us to suppose that its acquisition cannot have cost the conqueror either much time or much loss. Cyrus comes into the list as king of Babylon, and the inhabitants with their whole territory become tributary to the Persians, forming the richest satrapy in the empire; but we do not hear that the people were otherwise ill-used, and it is certain that the vast walls and gates were left untouched. This was very different from the way in which the Medes had treated Nineveh, which seems to have been ruined and for a long time absolutely uninhabited, though re-occupied on a reduced scale under the Parthian empire; and very different also from the way in which Babylon itself was treated twenty years afterwards by Darius, when reconquered after a revolt.

Babylon left in undiminished strength and population.

The importance of Babylon, marking as it does one of the peculiar forms of civilisation belonging to the ancient world in a state of full development, gives an interest even to the half-authenticated stories respecting its capture. The other exploits ascribed to Cyrus—his invasion of India, across the desert of Arachosia[1]—and his attack upon the Massagetæ, Nomads ruled by queen Tomyris and greatly resembling the Scythians, across the mysterious river which Herodotus calls Araxês—are too little known to be at all dwelt upon. In the latter he is said to have perished, his army being defeated in a bloody battle.[2] He was buried at Pasargadæ, in his native province of Persis Proper.

Cyrus attacks the Massagetæ—is defeated and slain.

below it: watching the opportunity of a festival day in Babylon, he let the water into both of these side ditches, which fell into the main stream again below the town: hence the main stream in its passage through the town became nearly dry. The narrative of Xenophôn, however, betrays itself as not having been written from information received on the spot, like that of Herodotus; for he talks of αἱ ἄκραι of Babylon, just as he speaks of the ἄκραι of the hill-towns of Karia (compare Cyropædia, vii. 4, 1, 7, with vii. 5, 34). There were no ἄκραι on the dead flat of Babylon.

[1] Arrian, vi. 24, 4.

[2] Herodot. i. 205—214; Arrian, v. 4, 14; Justin, i. 8; Strabo, xi. p. 512. According to Ktêsias, Cyrus was slain in an expedition against the Derbikes, a people in the Caucasian regions—though his army afterwards prove victorious and conquer the country (Ktesiæ Persica, c. 8—9)—see the comment of Bähr on the passage in his edition of Ktêsias.

where his tomb was honoured and watched until the breaking up of the empire,[1] while his memory was held in profound veneration among the Persians. Of his real exploits we know little or nothing, but in what we read respecting him there seems, though amidst constant fighting, very little cruelty. Xenophôn has selected his life as the subject of a moral romance, which for a long time was cited as authentic history, and which even now serves as an authority, express or implied, for disputable and even incorrect conclusions. His extraordinary activity and conquests admit of no doubt. He left the Persian empire[2] extending from Sogdiana and the rivers Jaxartês and Indus eastward, to the Hellespont and the Syrian coast westward, and his successors made no permanent addition to it except that of Egypt. Phœnicia and Judæa were dependencies of Babylon, at the time when he conquered it, with their princes and grandees in Babylonian captivity. As they seem to have yielded to him, and become his tributaries,[3] without difficulty, so the restoration of their captives was conceded to them. It was from Cyrus that the habits of the Persian kings took commencement, to dwell at Susa in the winter, and Ekbatana during the summer; the primitive territory of Persis, with its two towns of Persepolis and Pasargadæ, being reserved for the burial-place of the kings and the religious sanctuary of the empire. How or when the conquest of Susiana was made, we are not informed. It lay eastward of the Tigris, between Babylonia and Persis Proper, and its people, the Kissians, as far as we can discern, were of Assyrian and not of Arian race. The river Choaspês near Susa was supposed to furnish the only water fit for the palate of the Great King, and is said to have been carried about with him wherever he went.[4]

Extraordinary stimulus to the Persians, from the conquests of Cyrus.

While the conquests of Cyrus contributed to assimilate the distinct types of civilisation in Western Asia—not by elevating the worse, but by degrading the better—upon the native Persians themselves they operated as an extraordinary stimulus, provoking alike their pride, ambition, cupidity, and warlike propensities.

[1] Strabo, xv. p. 730, 731; Arrian, vi. 29.

[2] The town Kyra, or Kyropolis, on the river Sihon or Jaxartês, was said to have been founded by Cyrus—it was destroyed by Alexander (Strabo, xi. p. 517, 518; Arrian, iv. 2, 2; Curtius, vii. 6. 16).

[3] Herodot. iii. 19.

[4] Herodot. i. 188; Plutarch, Artaxerxês. c. 3; Diodôr. xvii. 71.

Not only did the territory of Persis Proper pay no tribute to Susa or Ekbatana—being the only district so exempted between the Jaxartês and the Mediterranean — but the vast tributes received from the remaining empire were distributed to a great degree among its inhabitants. Empire to them meant—for the great men, lucrative satrapies or pachalics, with powers altogether unlimited, pomp inferior only to that of the Great King, and standing armies which they employed at their own discretion, sometimes against each other[1] — for the common soldiers, drawn from their fields or flocks, constant plunder, abundant maintenance, and an unrestrained licence, either in the suite of one of the satraps, or in the large permanent troop which moved from Susa to Ekbatana with the Great King. And if the entire population of Persis Proper did not migrate from their abodes to occupy some of those more inviting spots which the immensity of the imperial dominion furnished — a dominion extending (to use the language of Cyrus the younger before the battle of Kunaxa)[2] from the region of insupportable heat to that of insupportable cold—this was only because the early kings discouraged such a movement, in order that the nation might maintain its military hardihood[3] and be in a situation to furnish undiminished supplies of soldiers. The self-esteem and arrogance of the Persians were no less remarkable than their avidity for sensual enjoyment. They were fond of wine to excess: their wives and their concubines were both numerous; and they adopted eagerly from foreign nations new fashions of luxury as well as of ornament. Even to novelties in religion they were not strongly averse. For though disciples of Zoroaster, with Magi as their priests and as indispensable companions of their sacrifices, worshipping Sun, Moon, Earth, Fire, &c., and recognising neither image, temple, nor altar—yet they had adopted the voluptuous worship of the goddess Mylitta from the Assyrians and Arabians. A numerous male offspring was the Persian's boast. His warlike character and consciousness of force were displayed in the education of these youths, who were taught, from five years old to twenty, only three things—to

Character of the Persians.

[1] Xenophôn, Anabas. i. 1, 8.
[2] Xenophôn. Anabas. i. 7, 6; Cyropæd. viii. 6, 19.
[3] Herodot. ix. 122.

ride, to shoot with the bow, and to speak the truth.[1] To owe money, or even to buy and sell, was accounted among the Persians disgraceful—a sentiment which they defended by saying that both the one and the other imposed the necessity of telling falsehood. To exact tribute from subjects, to receive pay or presents from the king, and to give away without forethought whatever was not immediately wanted, was their mode of dealing with money. Industrious pursuits were left to the conquered, who were fortunate if, by paying a fixed contribution and sending a military contingent when required, they could purchase undisturbed immunity for their remaining concerns.[2] They could not thus purchase safety for the family hearth, since we find instances of noble Grecian maidens torn from their parents for the harem of the satrap.[3]

To a people of this character, whose conceptions of political society went no farther than personal obedience to a chief, a conquerer like Cyrus would communicate the strongest excitement and enthusiasm of which they were capable. He had found them slaves, and made them masters: he was the first and greatest of national benefactors,[4] as well as the most forward of leaders in the field: they followed him from one conquest to another, during the thirty years of his reign, their love of empire growing with the empire itself. And this impulse of aggrandisement continued unabated during the reigns of his three next successors—Kambysês, Darius, and Xerxês—until it was at length violently stifled by the humiliating defeats of Platæa and Salamis; after which the Persians became content with defending themselves at home and playing a secondary game. But at the

Thirst for foreign conquest among the Persians, for three reigns after Cyrus.

[1] The modern Persians at this day exhibit almost matchless skill in shooting with the firelock, as well as with the bow, on horseback—see Sir John Malcolm, Sketches of Persia, ch. xvii. p. 201; see also Kinneir, Geographical Memoir of the Persian Empire, p. 32.

[2] About the attributes of the Persian character, see Herodot. i. 131—140: compare i. 153.

He expresses himself very strongly as to the facility with which the Persians imbibed foreign customs, and especially foreign luxuries (i. 135)—ξεινικὰ δὲ νόμαια Πέρσαι προσίενται ἀνδρῶν μάλιστα—καὶ εὐπαθείας τε παντοδαπὰς πυνθανόμενοι ἐπιτηδεύουσι.

That rigid tenacity of customs and exclusiveness of tastes, which mark the modern Orientals, appear to be of the growth of Mahometanism, and to distinguish them greatly from the old Zoroastrian Persians.

[3] Herodot. ix. 76: Plutarch, Artaxerx. c. 26.

[4] Herodot. i. 210; iii. 159.

time when Kambysês son of Cyrus succeeded to his father's sceptre, Persian spirit was at its highest point. He was not long in fixing upon a prey both richer and less hazardous than the Massagetæ, at the opposite extremity of the empire. Phœnicia and Judæa being already subject to him, he resolved to invade Egypt, then highly flourishing under the long and prosperous reign of Amasis. Not much pretence was needed to colour the aggression; so that the various stories which Herodotus mentions as causes of the war, are only interesting inasmuch as they imply a vein of Egyptian party-feeling—affirming that the invasion was brought upon Amasis by a daughter of Apriês, and was thus a judgment upon Amasis for having deposed Apriês. As to the manner in which the daughter had produced this effect, indeed, the most contradictory stories were circulated.[1]

B.C. 525. Kambysês succeeds his father Cyrus—his invasion of Egypt.

Kambysês summoned the forces of his empire for this new enterprise, and among them both the Phœnicians and the Asiatic Greeks, Æolic as well as Ionic,[2] insular as well as continental—nearly all the maritime force and skill of the Ægean Sea. He was apprised by a Greek deserter from the mercenaries in Egypt, named Phanês, of the difficulties of the march, and the best method of surmounting them; especially the three days of sandy desert, altogether without water, which lay between Egypt and Judæa. By the aid of the neighbouring Arabians—with whom he concluded a treaty, and who were requited for this service with the title of equal allies, free from all tribute—he was enabled to surmount this serious difficulty, and to reach Pelusium at the eastern mouth of the Nile, where the Ionian and Karian troops in the Egyptian service, as well as the Egyptian military, were assembled to oppose him.[3]

Fortunately for himself, the Egyptian king Amasis had died during the interval of the Persian preparations, a few months before the expedition took place—after forty-four years of un-

[1] Herodot. iii. 1—4.

[2] Herodot. iii. 1, 19, 44.

[3] The narrative of Ktêsias is, in respect both to the Egyptian expedition and to the other incidents of Persian history, quite different in its details from that of Herodotus, agreeing only in the main events (Ktêsias, Persica. c. 7). To blend the two together is impossible.

Tacitus (Histor. i. 11) notes the difficulty of approach for an invading army to Egypt—"Ægyptum, provinciam aditu difficilem, annonæ fecundam, superstitione ac lasciviâ discordem et mobilem," &c.

abated prosperity. His death, at this critical moment, was probably the main cause of the easy conquest which followed; his son Psammenitus succeeding to his crown, but neither to his abilities nor his influence. The result of the invasion was foreshadowed, as usual, by a menacing prodigy—rain falling at Thêbes in upper Egypt. It was brought about by a single victory, though bravely disputed, at Pelusium,—followed by the capture of Memphis with the person of king Psammenitus, after a siege of some duration. Kambysês had sent forward a Mitylenæan ship to Memphis, with heralds to summon the city. The Egyptians, in a paroxysm of fury, rushed out of the walls, destroyed the vessel, and tore the crew into pieces—a savage proceeding which drew upon them severe retribution after the capture. Psammenitus, after being at first treated with harshness and insult, was at length released and even allowed to retain his regal dignity as a dependent of Persia. But being soon detected, or at least believed to be concerned, in raising revolt against the conquerors, he was put to death, and Egypt was placed under a satrap.[1]

Death of Amasis king of Egypt, at the time when the Persian expedition was preparing—his son Psammenitus succeeds.

Conquest of Egypt by Kambysês.

There yet lay beyond Egypt territories for the Persians to conquer, though Kyrênê and Barka, the Greek colonies near the coast of Libya, placed themselves at once out of the reach of danger by sending to Kambysês tribute and submission at Memphis. He projected three new enterprises: one against Carthage, by sea; the other two, by land—against the Ethiopians, far to the southward up the course of the Nile—and against the oracle and Oasis of Zeus Ammôn, amidst the deserts of Libya. Towards Ethiopia he himself conducted his troops, but was compelled to bring them back without reaching it, since they were on the point of perishing with famine; while the division which he sent against the temple of Ammôn is said to have been overwhelmed by a sand-storm in the desert. The expedition against Carthage was given up, for a reason which well deserves to be commemorated. The Phœnicians, who

Submission of Kyrênê and Barka to Kambysês—his projects for conquering Libya and Ethiopia disappointed.

[1] Herodot. iii. 10—16. About the Arabians, between Judæa and Egypt, see iii. c. 5, 88—91.

formed the most efficient part of his navy, refused to serve against their kinsmen and colonists, pleading the sanctity of mutual oaths as well as the ties both of relationship and traffic.[1] Even the frantic Kambysês was compelled to accept, and perhaps to respect, this honourable refusal; which was not imitated by the Ionic Greeks when Darius and Xerxês demanded the aid of their ships against Athens—we must add, however, that they were then in a situation much more exposed and helpless than that in which the Phœnicians stood before Kambysês.

Among the sacred animals so numerous and so different throughout the various nomes of Egypt, the most venerated of all was the bull Apis. Such peculiar conditions were required by the Egyptian religion as to the birth, the age, and the marks of this animal, that when he died, it was difficult to find a new calf properly qualified to succeed him. Much time was sometimes spent in the search, and when an unexceptionable successor was at last found, the demonstrations of joy in Memphis were extravagant and universal. At the moment when Kambysês returned to Memphis from his Ethiopian expedition, full of humiliation for the result, it so happened that a new Apis was just discovered; and as the population of the city gave vent to their usual festive pomp and delight, he construed it into an intentional insult towards his own recent misfortunes. In vain did the priests and magistrates explain to him the real cause of these popular manifestations. He persisted in his belief, punished some of them with death and others with stripes, and commanded every man seen in holiday attire to be slain. Farthermore—to carry his outrage against Egyptian feeling to the uttermost pitch—he sent for the newly-discovered Apis, and plunged his dagger into the side of the animal, who shortly afterwards died of the wound.[2]

Insults of Kambysês to the Egyptian religion.

After this brutal deed—calculated to efface in the minds of the Egyptian priests the enormities of Cheops and Chephrên, and doubtless unparalleled in all the 24,000 years of their anterior history—Kambysês lost every spark of reason which yet remained to him. The Egyptians found in this visitation a new proof of

Madness of Kambysês—he puts to death his younger brother Smerdis.

[1] Herodot. iii. 19.

[2] Herodot. iii. 29.

the avenging interference of their gods. Not only did he commit every variety of studied outrage against the conquered people among whom he was tarrying, as well as their temples and their sepulchres—but he also dealt his blows against his Persian friends and even his nearest blood-relations. Among these revolting atrocities, one of the greatest deserves peculiar notice, because the fate of the empire was afterwards materially affected by it. His younger brother Smerdis had accompanied him into Egypt, but had been sent back to Susa, because the king became jealous of the admiration which his personal strength and qualities called forth.[1] That jealousy was aggravated into alarm and hatred by a dream portending dominion and conquest to Smerdis, and the frantic Kambysês sent to Susa secretly a confidential Persian, Prexaspês, with express orders to get rid of his brother. Prexaspês fulfilled his commission effectively, burying the slain prince with his own hands,[2] and keeping the deed concealed from all except a few of the chiefs at the regal residence.

Among these few chiefs, however, there was one, the Median Patizeithês, belonging to the order of the Magi, who saw in it a convenient stepping-stone for his own personal ambition, and made use of it as a means of covertly supplanting the dynasty of the great Cyrus. Enjoying the full confidence of Kambysês, he had been left by that prince on departing for Egypt in the entire management of the palace and treasures, with extensive authority.[3] Moreover he happened to have a brother extremely resembling in person the deceased Smerdis. As the open and dangerous madness of Kambysês contributed to alienate from him the minds of the Persians, Patizeithês resolved to proclaim this brother as king in his room, as if it were the younger son of Cyrus succeeding to the disqualified elder. On one important point, the false Smerdis differed from the true. He had lost his ears, which Cyrus himself had caused to be cut off for an offence ; but the personal resemblance, after all, was of little importance, since he was seldom or never allowed to show

Conspiracy of the Magian Patizeithês, who sets up his brother as king under the name of Smerdis.

[1] Ktêsias calls the brother Tanyoxarkês, and says that Cyrus had left him satrap, without tribute, of Baktria and the neighbouring regions (Persica, c. 8). Xenophôn in the Cyropædia also calls him Tanyoxarkês, but gives him a different satrapy (Cyropæd. viii. 7, 1).

[2] Herodot. iii. 30—62.

[3] Herodot. iii. 61—63.

himself to the people.[1] Kambysês heard of this revolt in Syria on his return from Egypt. He was mounting his horse in haste for the purpose of going to suppress it, when an accident from his sword put an end to his life. Herodotus tells us that before his death he summoned the Persians around him, confessed that he had been guilty of putting his brother to death, and apprised them that the reigning Smerdis was only a Median pretender—conjuring them at the same time not to submit to the disgrace of being ruled by any other than a Persian and an Achæmenid. But if it be true that he ever made known the facts, no one believed him. For Prexaspês on his part was compelled by regard to his own safety to deny that he had imbrued his hands in the blood of a son of Cyrus;[2] and thus the opportune death of Kambysês placed the false Smerdis without opposition at the head of the Persians, who all, or for the most part, believed themselves to be ruled by a genuine son of Cyrus. Kambysês had reigned for seven years and five months.

Death of Kambysês.

For seven months did Smerdis reign without opposition, seconded by his brother Patizeithês. If he manifested his distrust of the haughty Persians around him by neither inviting them into his palace nor showing himself out of it, he at the same time studiously conciliated the favour of the subject provinces, by remission of tribute and of military service for three years.[3] Such a departure from the Persian principle of government was in itself sufficient to disgust the warlike and rapacious Achæmenids at Susa; but it seems that their suspicions as to his genuine character had never been entirely set at rest, and in the eighth month those suspicions were converted into certainty. According to what seems to have been the Persian usage, he had taken to himself the entire harem of his predecessor, among whose wives was numbered Phædymê daughter of a distinguished Persian named Otanês. At the instance of her father, Phædymê undertook the dangerous task of feeling the head of Smerdis while he slept, and

B.C. 521.

Reign of the false Smerdis—conspiracy of the seven Persian noblemen against him—he is slain—Darius succeeds to the throne.

[1] Herodot. iii. 63–69.—"Auribus decisis vivere jubet," says Tacitus about a case under the Parthian government (Annal. xii. 14)—and the Turkish authorities have not given up the infliction of it at the present moment, or at least down to a very recent period.

[2] Herodot. iii. 64–66.

[3] Herodot. iii. 67.

thus detected the absence of ears.[1] Otanês, possessed of the decisive information, lost no time in concerting, with five other noble Achæmenids, means for ridding themselves of a king who was at once a Mede, a Magian, and a man without ears;[2] Darius, son of Hystaspês the satrap of Persis Proper, arriving just in time to join the conspiracy as the seventh. How these seven noblemen slew Smerdis in his palace at Susa—how they subsequently debated among themselves whether they should establish in Persia a monarchy, an oligarchy, or a democracy—how, after the first of the three had been resolved upon, it was determined that the future king, whichever he might be, should be bound to take his wives only from the families of the seven conspirators—how Darius became king from the circumstance of his horse being the first to neigh among those of the conspirators at a given spot, by the stratagem of the groom Œbarês—how Otanês, standing aside beforehand from this lottery for the throne, reserved for himself as well as for his descendants perfect freedom and exemption from the rule of the future king, whichsoever might draw the prize—all these incidents may be found recounted by Herodotus with his usual vivacity, but with no small addition of Hellenic ideas as well as of dramatic ornament.

It was thus that the upright tiara, the privileged head-dress of the Persian kings,[3] passed away from the lineage of Cyrus, yet without departing from the great phratry of the Achæmenidæ—to which Darius and his father Hystaspês, as well as Cyrus, belonged. That important fact is unquestionable, and probably the acts ascribed to the seven conspirators are in the main true, apart from their discussions and intentions. But on this, as well as on other occasions, we must guard ourselves against an illusion which the historical manner of Herodotus is apt to create. He presents to us with so much descriptive force the personal narrative—individual action and speech, with all its accompanying hopes, fears, doubts, and passions—that our attention is distracted

[1] Herodot. iii. 68—69.

[2] Herodot. iii. 69—73. ἀρχόμεθα μὲν ἐόντες Πέρσαι, ὑπὸ Μήδου ἀνδρὸς μάγου, καὶ τούτου ὦτα οὐκ ἔχοντος.

Compare the description of the insupportable repugnance of the Greeks of Kyrênê to be governed by the *lame* Battus (Herodot. iv. 161).

[3] Compare Aristophan. Aves, 487, with the Scholia, and Herodot. vii. 61; Arrian, iv. 6, 29. The cap of the Persians generally was loose, low, clinging about the head in folds; that of the king was high and erect above the head. See the notes of Wesseling and Schweighäuser upon πίλοι ἀπαγέες in Herodot. *l.c.*

from the political bearing of what is going on; which we are compelled often to gather up from hints in the speeches of performers, or from consequences afterwards indirectly noticed. When we put together all the incidental notices which he lets drop, it will be found that the change of sceptre from Smerdis to Darius was a far larger political event than his direct narrative would seem to announce. Smerdis represents preponderance to the Medes over the Persians, and comparative degradation to the latter; who, by the installation of Darius, are again placed in the ascendent. The Medes and the Magians are in this case identical; for the Magians, though indispensable in the capacity of priests to the Persians, were essentially one of the seven Median tribes.[1] It thus appears that though Smerdis ruled as a son of the great Cyrus, yet he ruled by means of Medes and Magians, depriving the Persians of that supreme privilege and predominance to which they had become accustomed.[2] We see this by what followed immediately after the assassination of Smerdis and his brother in the palace. The seven conspirators, exhibiting the bloody heads of both these victims as an evidence of their deed, instigated the Persians in Susa to a general massacre of the Magians, many of whom were actually slain, and the rest only escaped by flight, concealment, or the hour of night. And the anniversary of this day was celebrated afterwards among the Persians by a solemnity and festival, called the Magophonia; no Magian being ever allowed on that day to appear in public.[3] The

Political bearing of this conspiracy—Smerdis represents Median preponderance, which is again put down by Darius.

[1] Herodot. i. 101—120.

[2] In the speech which Herodotus puts into the mouth of Kambysês on his death-bed, addressed to the Persians around him in a strain of prophetic adjuration (iii. 65), he says—Καὶ δὴ ὑμῖν τάδε ἐπισκήπτω, θεοὺς τοὺς βασιληίους ἐπικαλέων, καὶ πᾶσιν ὑμῖν καὶ μάλιστα Ἀχαιμενιδέων τοῖσι παρεοῦσι, μὴ περιιδεῖν τὴν ἡγεμονίην αὖτις ἐς Μήδους περιελθοῦσαν· ἀλλ' εἴτε δόλῳ ἔχουσι αὐτὴν κτησάμενοι (the personification of the deceased son of Cyrus), δόλῳ ἀπαιρεθῆναι ὑπὸ ὑμέων· εἴτε καὶ σθενεῖ τεῳ κατεργασάμενοι, σθένεϊ κατὰ τὸ κάρτερον ἀναιρώσασθαι (the forcible opposition of the Medes to Darius, which he put down by superior force on the Persian side): compare the speech of Gobryas, one of the seven Persian conspirators (iii. 73), and that of Prexaspês (iii. 75); also Plato, Legg. iii. 12, p. 695.

Heeren has taken a correct view of the reign of Smerdis the Magian and its political character (Ideen über den Verkehr, &c., der Alten Welt, part i. Abth. i. p. 431.

[3] Herodot. iii. 79. Σπασάμενοι δὲ τὰ ἐγχειρίδια, ἔκτεινον ὅκου τινὰ μάγον εὕρισκον· εἰ δὲ μὴ νὺξ ἐπελθοῦσα ἔσχε, ἔλιπον ἂν οὐδένα μάγον. Ταύτην τὴν ἡμέρην θεραπεύουσι Πέρσαι κοινῇ μάλιστα τῶν ἡμερέων· καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ ὀρτὴν μεγάλην ἀνάγουσι, ἣ κέκληται ὑπὸ Περσέων Μαγοφόνια.

The periodical celebration of the Magophonia is attested by Ktêsias—one of the few points of complete agreement with Herodotus. He farther

descendants of the Seven maintained a privileged name and rank,[1] even down to the extinction of the monarchy by Alexander the Great.

Furthermore, it appears that the authority of Darius was not readily acknowledged throughout the empire, and that an interval of confusion ensued before it became so.[2] The Medes actually revolted, and tried to maintain themselves by force against Darius, who however found means to subdue them: though when he convoked his troops from the various provinces, he did not receive from the satraps universal obedience. The powerful Orœtês especially, who had been appointed by Cyrus satrap of Lydia and Ionia, not only sent no troops to the aid of Darius against the Medes,[3] but even took advantage of the disturbed state of the government to put to death his private enemy Mitrobatês, satrap of Phrygia, and appropriate that satrapy in addition to his own. Aryandês also, the satrap nominated by Kambysês in Egypt, comported himself as the equal of Darius rather than as his subject.[4] The subject provinces generally, to whom Smerdis had granted remission of tribute and military service for the space of three years, were grateful and attached to his memory, and noway pleased with the new dynasty. Moreover the revolt of the Babylonians, conceived a year or two before it was executed, took its rise from the feelings of this time.[5] But the renewal of the old conflict between the two principal sections of the empire, Medes and Persians, is doubtless the most important feature in this political revolution. The false Smerdis with his brother, both of them Medes and Magians, had revived the Median nationality to a state of supremacy over the Persian, recalling the

Revolt of the Medes —suppressed. Discontents of the satraps.

agrees in saying that a Magian usurped the throne, through likeness of person to the deceased son of Cyrus, whom Kambysês had slain—but all his other statements differ from Herodotus (Ktêsias, 10—14).

[1] Even at the battle of Arbela—"Summæ Orsines præerat, a septem Persis oriundus, ad Cyrum quoque, nobilissimum regem, originem sui referens". (Quintus Curtius, iv. 12, 7, or iv. 45, 7, Zumpt): compare Strabo, xi. p. 531; Florus, iii. 5, 1.

[2] Herodot. iii. 127. Δαρείῳ—ἅτε οἰδεόντων οἱ ἔτι τῶν πρηγμάτων, &c.—mention of the ταραχή (iii. 126, 150).

[3] Herodot. iii. 126. Μετὰ γὰρ τὸν Καμβύσεω θάνατον, καὶ τῶν Μάγων τὴν βασιληίην, μένων ἐν τῇσι Σάρδισι Ὀροίτης, ὠφέλει μὲν οὐδὲν Πέρσας, ὑπὸ Μήδων ἀπαραιρημένους τὴν ἀρχήν· ὁ δὲ ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ταραχῇ κατὰ μέν ἔκτεινε Μιτροβάτεα. . . . ἄλλα τε ἐξύβρισε παντοῖα, &c.

[4] Herodot. iv. 166. Ὁ δὲ Ἀρυάνδης ἦν οὗτος τῆς Αἰγύπτου ὕπαρχος ὑπὸ Καμβύσεω κατεστεώς· ὃς ὑστέρῳ χρόνῳ παρισεύμενος Δαρείῳ διεφθάρη.

[5] Herodot. iii. 67—150.

memory of what it had been under Astyagês; while Darius—a pure Persian, and not (like the mule Cyrus) half Mede and half Persian—replaced the Persian nationality in its ascendent condition, though not without the necessity of suppressing by force a rebellion of the Medes.[1]

[1] Herodot. i. 130. Ἀστυάγης μέν νυν βασιλεύσας ἐπ' ἔτεα πέντε καὶ τριήκοντα, οὕτω τῆς ἀρχῆς κατεπαύθη. Μῆδοι δὲ ὑπέκυψαν Πέρσῃσι διὰ τὴν τούτου πικρότητα. . . . . Ὑστέρῳ μέντοι χρόνῳ μετεμέλησέ τέ σφι ταῦτα ποιήσασι, καὶ ἀπέστησαν ἀπὸ Δαρείου· ἀποστάντες δὲ, ὀπίσω κατεστράφθησαν, μάχῃ νικηθέντες· τότε δὲ, ἐπὶ Ἀστυάγεος, οἱ Πέρσαι τε καὶ ὁ Κῦρος ἐπαναστάντες τοῖσι Μήδοισι, ἦρχον τὸ ἀπὸ τούτου τῆς Ἀσίης.

This passage—asserting that the Medes, some time after the deposition of Astyagês and the acquisition of Persian supremacy by Cyrus, repented of having suffered their discontent against Astyagês to place this supremacy in the hands of the Persians, revolted from Darius, and were reconquered after a contest—appears to me to have been misunderstood by chronologists. Dodwell, Larcher, and Mr. Fynes Clinton (indeed most, if not all, of the chronologists) explain it as alluding to a revolt of the Medes against the Persian king Darius Nothus, mentioned in the Hellenica of Xenophôn (i. 2, 12), and belonging to the year 408 B.C. See Larcher ad Herodot. i. 130, and his Vie d'Herodote, prefixed to his translation (p. lxxxix); also Mr. Clinton, Fasti Hellenici, ad ann. 408 and 455, and his Appendix, c. 18, p. 316.

The revolt of the Medes alluded to by Herodotus is, in my judgment, completely distinct from the revolt mentioned by Xenophôn: to identify the two, as these eminent chronologists do, is an hypothesis not only having nothing to recommend it, but open to grave objection. The revolt mentioned by Herodotus was against Darius son of Hystaspês, not against Darius Nothus; and I have set forth with peculiar care the circumstances connected with the conspiracy and accession of the former, for the purpose of showing that they all decidedly imply that conflict between Median and Persian supremacy, which Herodotus directly announces in the passage now before us.

1. When Herodotus speaks of Darius, without any adjective designation, why should we imagine that he means any other than Darius the son of Hystaspês, on whom he dwells so copiously in his narrative? Once only in the course of his history (ix. 108) another Darius (the young prince, son of Xerxês the first) is mentioned; but with this exception, Darius son of Hystaspês is uniformly throughout the work spoken of under his simple name: Darius Nothus is never alluded to at all.

2. The deposition of Astyagês took place in 559 B.C.; the beginning of the reign of Darius occurred in 520 B.C. Now repentance on the part of the Medes, for what they had done at the former of those two epochs, might naturally prompt them to try to repair it in the latter. But between the deposition of Astyagês in 559 B.C., and the revolt mentioned by Xenophôn against Darius Nothus in 408 B.C., the interval is more than 150 years. To ascribe a revolt which took place in 408 B.C. to repentance for something which had occurred 150 years before, is unnatural and far-fetched, if not positively inadmissible.

The preceding arguments go to show that the natural construction of the passage in Herodotus points to Darius son of Hystaspês, and not to Darius Nothus; but this is not all. There are yet stronger reasons why the reference to Darius Nothus should be discarded.

The supposed mention in Herodotus of a fact so late as 408 B.C. perplexes the whole chronology of his life and authorship. According to the usual statement of his biography, which there is no reason to call in question, he was born in 484 B.C. Here then is an event alluded to in his history, which occurred when the historian was seventy-six years old, and the allusion to which he must be presumed to have written when about eighty years old, if not more; for his mention of the fact by no means implies that it was particularly recent. Those who adopt this view do not imagine that he wrote his whole history at that age; but they maintain that he made later additions, of which they contend that this is one. I do not say that this is

It has already been observed that the subjugation of the recusant Medes was not the only embarrassment of the first years of Darius. Orœtês, satrap of Phrygia, Lydia, and Ionia, ruling seemingly the entire western coast of Asia Minor—possessing a

impossible: we know that Isokratês composed his Panathenaic oration at the age of ninety-four; but it must be admitted to be highly improbable—a supposition which ought not to be advanced without some cogent proof to support it. But here no proof whatever is produced. Herodotus mentions a revolt of the Medes against Darius—Xenophôn also mentions a revolt of the Medes against Darius; hence chronologists have taken it as a matter of course, that both authors must allude to the same event; though the supposition is unnatural as regards the text, and still more unnatural as regards the biography of Herodotus.

In respect to that biography, Mr. Clinton appears to me to have adopted another erroneous opinion; in which, however, both Larcher and Wesseling are against him, though Dahlmann and Heyse agree with him. He maintains that the passage in Herodotus (iii. 15), wherein it is stated that Pausiris succeeded his father Amyrtæus by consent of the Persians in the government of Egypt, is to be referred to a fact which happened subsequent to the year 414 B.C., or the tenth year of Darius Nothus; since it was in that year that Amyrtæus acquired the government of Egypt. But this opinion rests altogether upon the assumption that a certain Amyrtæus, whose name and date occur in Manetho (see Eusebius, Chronicon), is the same person as the Amyrtæus mentioned in Herodotus; which identity is not only not proved, but is extremely improbable, since Mr. Clinton himself admits (F. H. Appendix, p. 317), while maintaining the identity—"He (Amyrtæus) had conducted a war against the Persian government *more than fifty years before*". This, though not impossible, is surely very improbable; it is at least equally probable that the Amyrtæus of Manetho was a different person from (perhaps even the *grandson* of) that Amyrtæus in Herodotus who had carried on war against the Persians more than fifty years before; it appears to me, indeed, that this is the more reasonable hypothesis of the two.

I have permitted myself to prolong this note to an unusual length, because the supposed mention of such recent events in the history of Herodotus, as those in the reign of Darius Nothus, has introduced very gratuitous assumptions as to the time and manner in which that history was composed. It cannot be shown that there is a single event of precise and ascertained date, alluded to in his history, later than the capture of the Lacedæmonian heralds in the year 430 B.C. (Herodot. vii. 137; see Larcher, Vie d'Hérodote, p. lxxxix.); and this renders the composition of his history as an entire work much more smooth and intelligible.

It may be worth while to add, that if we read attentively Herodotus vi. 98—and reflect at the same time that the destruction of the Athenian armament at Syracuse (the greatest of all Hellenic disasters, hardly inferior for its time to the Russian campaign of Napoleon, and especially impressive to one living at Thurii, as may be seen by the life of Lysias, Plutarch, Vit. X. Oratt. p. 835) happened during the reign of Darius Nothus in 415 B.C.—we shall not readily admit the hypothesis of additions made to the history during the reign of the latter, or so late as 408 B.C. Herodotus would hardly have dwelt so expressly and emphatically upon mischief done by Greeks to each other in the reigns of Darius son of Hystaspês, Xerxês and Artaxerxês, if he had lived to witness the greater mischiefs so inflicted during the reign of Darius Nothus, and had kept his history before him for the purpose of inserting new events. The destruction of the Athenians before Syracuse would have been a thousand times more striking to his imagination than the revolt of the Medes against Darius Nothus, and would have impelled him with much greater force to alter or enlarge the chapter vi. 98.

The sentiment too which Herodotus places in the mouth of Demaratus respecting the Spartans (vii. 104) appears to have been written *before* the capture of the Spartans in Sphakteria, in 425 B.C., rather than *after* it: compare Thucyd. iv. 40.

Dahlmann (Forschungen auf dem

large military force and revenue, and surrounded by a body-guard of 1000 native Persians—maintained a haughty independence. He secretly made away with couriers sent to summon him to Susa, and even wreaked his vengeance upon some of the principal Persians who had privately offended him. Darius, not thinking it prudent to attack him by open force, proposed to the chief Persians at Susa the dangerous problem of destroying him by stratagem. Thirty among them volunteered to undertake it, and Bagæus son of Artontês, to whom on drawing lots the task devolved, accomplished it by a manœuvre which might serve as a lesson to the Ottoman government in its embarrassments with contumacious Pachas. Having proceeded to Sardis, furnished with many different royal ordinances, formally set forth and bearing the seal of Darius, he was presented to Orœtês in audience, with the public secretary of the satrapy close at hand, and the Persian guards standing around. He presented his ordinances to be read aloud by the secretary, choosing first those which related to matters of no great importance; but when he saw that the guards listened with profound reverence, and that the king's name and seal imposed upon them irresistibly, he ventured upon the real purport of his perilous mission. An ordinance was handed to the secretary, and read by him aloud, as follows: "Persians, king Darius forbids you to serve any longer as guards to Orœtês". The obedient guards at once delivered up their spears, when Bagæus caused the final warrant to be read to them: "King Darius commands the Persians in Sardis to kill Orœtês". The guards drew their swords and killed him on the spot: his large treasure was conveyed to Susa: Darius became undisputed master, and probably Bagæus satrap.[1]

Revolt of Babylon.

Another devoted adherent, and another yet more memorable piece of cunning, laid prostrate before Darius the mighty walls and gates of the revolted Babylon. The inhabitants of that city had employed themselves assiduously—both during the lax provincial superintendence of the false Smerdis and during the period of confusion and conflict

Gebiete der Geschichte, vol. ii. p. 41—47) and Heyse (Quæstiones Herodoteæ, p. 74—77, Berlin, 1827) both profess to point out six passages in Herodotus which mark events of later date than 430 B.C. But none of the chronological indications which they adduce appear to me trustworthy.

[1] Herodot. iii. 127, 128.

which elapsed before Darius became firmly established and obeyed—in making every preparation both for declaring and sustaining their independence. Having accumulated a large store of provisions and other requisites for a long siege, without previous detection, they at length proclaimed their independence openly. Such was the intensity of their resolution to shake off the yoke, that they had recourse to a proceeding, which, if correctly reported by Herodotus, forms one of the most frightful enormities recorded in his history. To make their provisions last out longer, they strangled all the women in the city, reserving only their mothers, and one woman to each family for the purpose of baking.[1] We cannot but suppose that this has been magnified from a partial into a universal destruction; but taking it even with such allowance, it illustrates that ferocious force of will, and that predominance of strong nationality, combined with antipathy to foreigners, over all the gentler sympathies, which seems to mark the Semitic nations, and which may be traced so conspicuously in the Jewish history of Josephus.

Darius, assembling all the forces in his power, laid siege to the revolted city, but could make no impression upon it either by force or by stratagem. He tried to repeat the proceeding by which Cyrus had taken it at first; but the besieged were found this time on their guard. The siege had lasted twenty months without the smallest progress, and the Babylonians derided the besiegers from the height of their impregnable walls, when a distinguished Persian nobleman Zopyrus—son of Megabyzus, who had been one of the seven conspirators against Smerdis—presented himself one day before Darius in a state of frightful mutilation. His nose and ears were cut off, and his body misused in every way. He had designedly thus maimed himself, "thinking it intolerable that Assyrians should thus laugh the Persians to scorn,"[2] in the intention, which he presently intimated to Darius, of passing into the town as a deserter, with the view of betraying it—for which purpose measures were concerted. The Babylonians, seeing a Persian of the highest rank in so calamitous a condition, readily believed his assurance that

[1] Herodot. iii. 150.

[2] Herodot. iii. 155. δεινόν τι ποιεύμενος, Ἀσσυρίους Πέρσῃσι καταγελᾶν. Compare the speech of Mardonius, vii. 9. The horror of Darius, at the first sight of Zopyrus in this condition, is strongly dramatised by Herodotus.

he had been thus punished by the king's order, and that he came over to them as the only means of procuring for himself signal vengeance. Entrusted by them with the command of a detachment, he gained several advantages in different sallies, according to previous concert with Darius, until at length the Babylonians, grateful and confident, placed under his charge the principal gates. At the critical moment these gates were thrown open, and the Persians became masters of the city.[1]

Thus was the impregnable Babylon a second time reduced.[2]

Reconquered and dismantled by Darius.

Darius took precautions on this occasion to put it out of condition for resisting a third time. He caused the walls and gates to be demolished, and three thousand of the principal citizens to be crucified. The remaining inhabitants were left in the dismantled city, fifty thousand women being levied by assessment upon the neighbouring provinces, to supply the place of the women strangled when it first revolted.[3] Zopyrus was appointed satrap of the territory

[1] Herodot. iii. 154—158.

[2] Ktêsias represents the revolt and recapture of Babylon to have taken place, not under Darius, but under his son and successor Xerxês. He says that the Babylonians, revolting, slew their satrap Zopyrus; that they were besieged by Xerxês, and that Megabyzus, son of Zopyrus, caused the city to be taken by practising that very stratagem which Herodotus ascribes to Zopyrus himself (Persica, c. 20—22).

This seems inconsistent with the fact that Megabyzus was general of the Persian army in Egypt in the war with the Athenians, about 460 B.C. (Diodôr. Sic. xi. 75—77). He would hardly have been sent on active service had he been so fearfully mutilated: moreover, the whole story of Ktêsias appears to me far less probable than that of Herodotus; for on this, as on other occasions, to blend the two together is impossible.

[3] Herodot. iii. 159, 160. "From the women thus introduced (says Herodotus) the present Babylonians are sprung."

To crucify subdued revolters by thousands is, fortunately, so little in harmony with modern European manners, that it may not be amiss to strengthen the confidence of the reader in the accuracy of Herodotus, by producing an analogous narrative of incidents far more recent. Voltaire gives, from the MS. of General Lefort, one of the principal and confidential officers of Peter the Great, the following account of the suppression of the revolted Strelitzes at Moscow in 1698: these Strelitzes were the old native militia or Janissaries of the Russian Czars, opposed to all the reforms of Peter.

"Pour étouffer ces troubles, le czar part secrètement de Vienne, arrive enfin à Moscou, et surprend tout le monde par sa présence: il récompense les troupes qui ont vaincu les Strélitz: les prisons étaient pleines de ces malheureux. Si leur crime était grand, le châtiment le fut aussi. Leurs chefs, plusieurs officiers, et quelques prêtres, furent condamnés à la mort: quelques-uns furent roués, deux femmes enterrées vives. On pendit autour des murailles de la ville et on fit périr dans d'autres supplices deux mille Strélitz: leurs corps restèrent deux jours exposés sur les grands chemins, et surtout autour du monastère où résidaient les princesses Sophie et Eudoxe. On érigea des colonnes de pierre où le crime et le châtiment furent gravés. Un très-grand nombre qui avaient leurs femmes et leurs enfans furent dispersés avec leurs familles dans la Sibérie, dans le royaume d'Astrakhan, dans le pays

for life, with enjoyment of its entire revenues, receiving besides every additional reward which it was in the power of Darius to bestow, and generous assurances from the latter that he would rather have Zopyrus without wounds than the possession of Babylon. I have already intimated in a former chapter that the demolition of the walls here mentioned is not to be regarded as complete and continuous, nor was there any necessity that it should be so. Partial demolition would be quite sufficient to leave the city without defence; and the description given by Herodotus of the state of things as they stood at the time of his visit, proves that portions of the walls yet subsisted. One circumstance is yet to be added in reference to the subsequent condition of Babylon under the Persian empire. The city with the territory belonging to it constituted a satrapy, which not only paid a larger tribute (one thousand Euboic talents of silver) and contributed a much larger amount of provisions in kind for the maintenance of the Persian court, than any other among the twenty satrapies of the empire, but furnished besides an annual supply of five hundred eunuch youths.[1] We may presume that this was intended in part as a punishment for the past revolt, since the like obligation was not imposed upon any other satrapy.

Organization of the Persian empire by Darius.

Thus firmly established on the throne, Darius occupied it for thirty-six years. His reign was one of organization, different from that of his two predecessors; a difference which the Persians well understood and noted, calling Cyrus the father, Kambysês the master, and Darius the retail-trader or huckster.[2] In the mouth of the Persians this latter epithet must be construed as no insignificant compliment, since it intimates that he was the first to introduce some methodical order into the imperial administration and finances. Under the two former kings there was no definite

d'Azof: par là du moins leur punition fut utile à l'état: ils servirent à défricher des terres qui manquaient d'habitans et de culture." (Voltaire, Histoire de Russie, part i., ch. x., tom. 31, of the Œuvres Complètes de Voltaire, p. 148, ed. Paris, 1825.)

1 Herodot. iii. 92.

2 Herodot. iii. 89. What the Persian denomination was, which Herodotus or his informants translated κάπηλος, we do not know; but this latter word was used often by Greeks to signify a cheat or deceiver generally: see Etymologic. Magn. p. 490, 11, and Suidas, v. Κάπηλος. 'Ο δ' Αἰσχυλος τὰ δόλια πάντα καλεῖ κάπηλα—"Κάπηλα προσφέρων τεχνήματα." (Æschylus, Fragment. 328, ed. Dindorf: compare Euripid. Hippolyt. 953.)

amount of tribute levied upon the subject provinces. They furnished what were called presents, subject to no fixed limit except such as might be satisfactory to the satrap in each district. But Darius, succeeding as he did to Smerdis, who had rendered himself popular with the provinces by large financial exemptions, and having farther to encounter jealousy and dissatisfaction from Persians, his former equals in rank, probably felt it expedient to relieve the provinces from the burden of undefined exactions. He distributed the whole empire into twenty departments, imposing upon each a fixed annual tax, and a fixed contribution for the maintenance of the court. This must doubtless have been a great improvement, though the limitation of the sum which the Great King at Susa would require did not at all prevent the satrap in his own province from indefinite requisitions beyond it. The satrap was a little king, who acted nearly as he pleased in the internal administration of his province, subject only to the necessity of sending up the imperial tribute, of keeping off foreign enemies, and of furnishing an adequate military contingent for the foreign enterprises of the Great King. To every satrap was attached a royal secretary or comptroller of the revenue,[1] who probably managed the imperial finances in the province, and to whom the court of Susa might perhaps look as a watch upon the satrap himself. It is not to be supposed that the Persian authorities in any province meddled with the details of taxation or contribution, as they bore upon individuals. The court having fixed the entire sum payable by the satrapy in the aggregate, the satrap or the secretary apportioned it among the various component districts, towns, or provinces, leaving to the local authorities in each of these latter the task of assessing it upon individual inhabitants. From necessity, therefore, as well as from indolence of temper and political incompetence, the Persians were compelled to respect the authorities which they found standing both in town and country, and to leave in their hands a large measure of genuine influence; frequently overruled indeed by oppressive

[1] Herodot. iii. 128. This division of power, and double appointment by the Great King, appears to have been retained until the close of the Persian empire: see Quintus Curtius, v. 1, 17—20 (v. 3, 19—21, Zumpt). The present Turkish government nominates a Defterdar as finance administrator in each province, with authority derived directly from itself, and professedly independent of the Pacha.

interference on the part of the satrap, whenever any of his passions prompted, but never entirely superseded. In the important towns and stations, Persian garrisons were usually kept, and against the excesses of the military there was probably little or no protection to the subject people. Yet still the provincial governments were allowed to continue, and often even the petty kings who had governed separate districts during their state of independence prior to the Persian conquest retained their title and dignity as tributaries to the court of Susa.[1] The empire of the Great King was thus an aggregate of heterogeneous elements, connected together by no tie except that of common fear and subjection—noway coherent nor self-supporting, nor pervaded by any common system or spirit of nationality. It resembled in its main political features the Turkish and Persian empires of the present day,[2] though distinguished materially by the many differences arising out of Mahometanism and Christianity, and perhaps hardly reaching the same extreme of rapacity, corruption, and cruelty in detail.

Twenty satrapies, with a fixed tribute apportioned to each.

Darius distributed the Persian empire into twenty satrapies, each including a certain continuous territory, and one or more nations inhabiting it, the names of which Herodotus sets forth. The amount of tribute payable by each satrapy was determined: payable in gold, according to the Euboic talent, by the Indians in the easternmost satrapy—in silver, according to the Babylonian or larger talent, by the remaining nineteen. Herodotus computes the ratio of gold to silver as 13 : 1. From the nineteen satrapies which paid in silver, there was levied annually the sum of 7740 Babylonian talents, equal to something about £2,964,000 sterling: from the Indians, who alone paid in gold, there was received a sum equal (at the rate of 1 : 13) to 4680 Euboic talents of silver, or to about £1,290,000 sterling.[3] To explain how it

[1] Herodot. iii. 15.

[2] Respecting the administration of the modern Persian empire, see Kinneir, Geograph. Memoir of Persia, pp. 29, 43, 47.

[3] Herodot. iii. 95. The text of Herodotus contains an erroneous summing up of items, which critics have no means of correcting with certainty. Nor is it possible to trust the large sum which he alleges to have been levied from the Indians, though all the other items, included in the nineteen silver-paying divisions, seem within the probable truth. Indeed both Rennell and Robertson think the total too small: the charges on some of the satrapies are decidedly smaller than the reality.

The vast sum of 50,000 talents is

happened that this one satrapy was charged with a sum equal to two-fifths of the aggregate charge on the other nineteen, Herodotus dwells upon the vast population, the extensive territory, and the abundant produce in gold, among those whom he calls Indians—the easternmost inhabitants of the earth, since beyond them there was nothing but uninhabitable sand—reaching, as far as we can make it out, from Baktria southward along the Indus to its mouth, but how far eastward we cannot determine. Darius is said to have undertaken an expedition against them and subdued them. Moreover, he is affirmed to have constructed and despatched vessels down the Indus, from the city of Kaspatyri and the territory of the Paktyes, in its upper regions, all the way down to its mouth: then into the Indian Ocean, round the peninsula of Arabia, and up the Red Sea to Egypt. The ships were commanded by a Greek—Skylax, of Karyanda on the south-western coast of Asia Minor;[1] who, if this statement be correct, executed a scheme of nautical enterprise not only one hundred and seventy years earlier, but also far more extensive, than the famous voyage of Nearchus, admiral

said to have been found by Alexander the Great laid up by successive kings at Susa alone, besides the treasures at Persepolis, Pasargadæ, and elsewhere (Arrian, iii. 16, 22; Plutarch, Alexand. 37). Presuming these talents to be Babylonian or Æginæan talents (in the proportion 5 : 3 to Attic talents), 50,000 talents would be equal to £19,000,000 sterling: if they were Attic talents, it would be equal to £11,600,000 sterling. The statements of Diodôrus give even much larger sums (xvii. 66—71: compare Curtius, v. 2, 8; v. 6, 9: Strabo, xv. p. 730). It is plain that the numerical affirmations were different in different authors, and one cannot pretend to pronounce on the trustworthiness of such large figures without knowing more of the original returns on which they were founded. That there were prodigious sums of gold and silver, is quite unquestionable. Respecting the statement of the Persian revenue given by Herodotus, see Boeckh, Metrologie, ch. v. 1, 2.

Amedée Jaubert, in 1806, estimated the population of the modern Persian empire at about 7,000,000 souls; of which about 6,000,000 settled population, the rest nomadic: he also estimated the Schah's revenue at about 2,900,000 tomans, or £1,500,000 sterling. Others calculated the population higher, at nearer 12,000,000 souls. Kinneir gives the revenue at something more than £3,000,000 sterling: he thinks that the whole territory between the Euphratês and the Indus does not contain above 18,000,000 of souls (Geogr. Memoir of Persia, p. 44—47: compare Ritter, West-Asien, Abtheil ii. Abschn. iv. p. 879—889).

The modern Persian empire contains not so much as the eastern half of the ancient, which covered all Asiatic Turkey and Egypt besides.

[1] Herodot. ii. 102, iv. 44. See the two Excursus of Bähr on these two chapters, vol. ii. p. 648—671 of his edit. of Herodotus.

It certainly is singular that neither Nearchus, nor Ptolemy, nor Aristobulus, nor Arrian, take any notice of this remarkable voyage distinctly asserted by Herodotus to have been accomplished. Such silence however affords no sufficient reason for calling the narrative in question. The attention of the Persian kings, successors to Darius, came to be far more occupied with the western than with the eastern portions of their empire.

of Alexander the Great, who only went from the Indus to the Persian Gulf. The eastern portions of the Persian empire remained so unknown and unvisited until the Macedonian invasion, that we are unable to criticise the isolated statements of Herodotus. None of the Persian kings subsequent to Darius appear to have visited them, and whether the prodigious sum demandable from them according to the Persian rent-roll was ever regularly levied may reasonably be doubted. At the same time, we may readily believe that the mountains in the northern parts of Persian India (Cabul and Little Thibet) were at that time extremely productive in gold, and that quantities of that metal, such as now appear almost fabulous, may have been often obtained. It seems that the produce of gold in all parts of the earth, as far as hitherto known, is obtained exclusively near the surface; so that a country once rich in that metal may well have been exhausted of its whole supply, and left at a later period without any gold at all.

Imposts upon the different satrapies.

Of the nineteen silver-paying satrapies, the most heavily imposed was Babylonia, which paid 1000 talents. The next in amount of charge was Egypt, paying 700 talents, besides the produce of the fish from the lake of Mœris: the remaining satrapies varied in amount, down as low as 170 talents, which was the sum charged on the seventh satrapy (in the enumeration of Herodotus) comprising the Sattagydæ, the Gandarii, the Dodikæ, and the Aparytæ. The Ionians, Æolians, Magnesians on the Mæander and on Mount Sipylus, Karians, Lykians, Milyans, and Pamphylians—including the coast of Asia Minor southward of Kanê, and from thence round the southern promontory to Phasêlis—were rated as one division, paying 400 talents. Yet we may be sure that much more than this was really taken from the people, when we read that Magnesia alone afterwards paid to Themistoklês a revenue of 50 talents annually.[1] The Mysians and Lydians were included, with some others, in another division; and the Hellespontine Greeks in a third, with Phrygians, Bithynians, Paphlagonians, Mariandynians, and Syrians, paying 360 talents—nearly the same as was paid by Syria Proper, Phœnicia, and Judæa, with the island

[1] Thucyd. i. 138.

of Cyprus. Independent of this regular tribute, with the undefined sums extorted over and above it,[1] there were some dependent nations, which, though exempt from tribute, furnished occasional sums called presents. Farther contributions were exacted for the maintenance of the vast suite who always personally attended the king. One entire third of this last burden was borne by Babylonia alone in consequence of its exuberant fertility:[2] it was paid in produce, as indeed the peculiar productions of every part of the empire seem to have been sent up for the regal consumption.

Organizing tendency of Darius—first imperial coinage—imperial roads and posts.

However imperfectly we are now able to follow the geographical distribution of the subject nations as given by Herodotus, it is extremely valuable as the only professed statistics remaining of the entire Persian empire. The arrangement of satrapies, which he describes, underwent modification in subsequent times; at least it does not harmonise with various statements in the Anabasis of Xenophôn, and in other authors who recount Persian affairs belonging to the fourth century B.C. But we find in no other author except Herodotus any entire survey and distribution of the empire. It is indeed a new tendency which now manifests itself in the Persian Darius, compared with his predecessors: not simply to conquer, to extort, and to give away—but to do all this with something like method and system,[3] and to define the obligations of the satraps towards Susa. Another remarkable example of the same tendency is to be found in the fact, that Darius was the first Persian king who coined money. His coin both in gold and silver, the Daric, was the earliest produce of a Persian mint.[4] The revenue, as brought

[1] Herodot. iii. 117.

[2] Herodot. ii. 192. Compare the description of the dinner and supper of the Great King, in Polyænus, iv. 3, 32; also Ktêsias and Deinôn ap. Athenæum, ii. p. 67.

[3] Plato, Legg. iii. 12, p. 695.

[4] Herodot. iv. 166; Plutarch, Kimôn, 10.

The gold Daric, of the weight of two Attic drachmæ (Statêr Daricus), equivalent to 20 Attic silver drachmæ (Xenoph. Anabas. i. 7, 18), would be about 16*s.* 3*d.* English. But it seems doubtful whether that ratio between gold and silver (10 : 1) can be reckoned upon as the ordinary ratio in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. Mr. Hussey calculates the golden Daric as equal to £1 1*s.* 3*d.* English (Hussey, Essay on the Ancient Weights and Money, Oxford, 1836, ch. iv. s. 8, p. 68; ch. vii. s. 3, p. 103).

I cannot think, with Mr. Hussey, that there is any reason for believing either the name or the coin *Daric* to be older than Darius son of Hystaspês. Compare Boeckh, Metrologie, ix. 5, p. 129.

Particular statements respecting the value of gold and silver, as exchanged one against the other, are to be received

to Susa in metallic money of various descriptions, was melted down separately, and poured in a fluid state into jars or earthenware vessels. When the metal had cooled and hardened, the jar was broken, leaving a standing solid mass from which portions were cut off as the occasion required.[1] And in addition to these administrative, financial, and monetary arrangements, of which Darius was the first originator, we may probably ascribe to him the first introduction of that system of roads, resting-places, and permanent relays of couriers, which connected both Susa and Ekbatana with the distant portions of the empire. Herodotus describes in considerable detail the imperial road from Sardis to Susa, a journey of ninety days, crossing the Halys, the Euphratês, the Tigris, the Greater and Lesser Zab, the Gyndês, and the Choaspês. In his time it was kept in excellent order, with convenience for travellers.[2]

It was Darius also who first completed the conquest of the Ionic Greeks by the acquisition of the important island of Samos. That island had maintained its independence, at the time when the Persian general Harpagus effected the conquest of Ionia, and even when Chios and Lesbos submitted. The Persians had no fleet to attack it; nor had the Phœnicians yet been taught to round the Triopian Cape. Indeed the depression which overtook the other cities of Ionia tended rather to the aggrandisement of Samos, under the energetic and unscrupulous despotism of Polykratês. That ambitious Samian, about ten years after the conquest of Sardis by Cyrus (seemingly between 536—532 B.C.), contrived to seize by force or fraud the government of his native island, with the aid of his brothers Pantagnôtus and Sylosôn, and a small band of conspirators.[3] At first the three brothers shared

Island of Samos—its condition at the accession of Darius. Polykratês.

with some reserve as the basis of any general estimate, since we have not the means of comparing a great many such statements together. For the process of coinage was imperfectly performed, and the different pieces, both of gold and silver, in circulation, differed materially in weight one with the other. Herodotus gives the ratio of gold to silver as 13 : 1.

[1] Herodot. iii. 96.

[2] Herodot. v. 52—53; viii. 98. "It appears to be a favourite idea with all barbarous princes that the badness of the roads adds considerably to the natural strength of their dominions. The Turks and Persians are undoubtedly of this opinion: the public highways are therefore neglected, and particularly so towards the frontiers." (Kinneir, Geog. Mem. of Pers. p. 43.)

The description of Herodotus contrasts favourably with the picture here given by Mr. Kinneir.

[3] Herodot. iii. 120.

the supreme power; but presently Polykratês put to death Pantagnôtus, banished Syloson, and made himself despot alone. In this station his ambition, his perfidy, and his good fortune were alike remarkable. He conquered several of the neighbouring islands, and even some towns on the mainland: he carried on successful war against Milêtus, and signally defeated the Lesbian ships which came to assist Milêtus: he got together a force of one hundred armed ships called pentekonters, and one thousand mercenary bowmen—aspiring to nothing less than the dominion of Ionia, with the islands in the Ægean. Alike terrible to friend and foe by his indiscriminate spirit of aggression, he acquired a naval power which seems at that time to have been the greatest in the Grecian world.[1] He had been in intimate alliance with Amasis king of Egypt, who however ultimately broke with him. Considering his behaviour towards allies, this rupture is not at all surprising; but Herodotus ascribes it to the alarm which Amasis conceived at the uninterrupted and superhuman good fortune of Polykratês—a degree of good fortune sure to draw down ultimately corresponding intensity of suffering from the hands of the envious gods. Indeed Herodotus—deeply penetrated with this belief in an ever-present Nemesis, which allows no man to be very happy, or long happy, with impunity—throws it into the form of an epistolary warning from Amasis to Polykratês, advising him to inflict upon himself some seasonable mischief or suffering; in order, if possible, to avert the ultimate judgment—to let blood in time, so that the plethora of happiness might not end in apoplexy.[2] Pursuant to such counsel, Polykratês threw into the sea a favourite ring of matchless price and beauty; but unfortunately, in a few days, the ring reappeared in the belly of a fine fish, which a fisherman had sent to him as a present. Amasis, now forewarned that the final apoplexy was inevitable, broke off the alliance with Polykratês without delay. This well-known story, interesting as evidence of ancient belief, is not less to be noted as showing the power of that belief to beget fictitious details out of real characters, such as I have already touched upon in the history of Solôn and Crœsus, and elsewhere.

[1] Herodot. iii. 39; Thucyd. i. 13.

[2] Herodot. iii. 40—42. . . . ἦν τε μὴ ἐναλλὰξ ἤδη τὸ ἀπὸ τούτου αἱ εὐτυχίαι τοι τοῖσι πάθεσι προσπίπτωσι, τρόπῳ τῷ ἐξ ἐμεῦ ὑποκειμένῳ ἄκεο: compare VII. 203, and i. 32.

The facts mentioned by Herodotus rather lead us to believe that it was Polykratês, who, with characteristic faithlessness, broke off his friendship with Amasis;[1] finding it suitable to his policy to cultivate the alliance of Kambysês, when that prince was preparing for his invasion of Egypt. In that invasion the Ionic subjects of Persia were called upon to serve, and Polykratês, deeming it a good opportunity to rid himself of some Samian malcontents, sent to the Persian king to tender auxiliaries from himself. Kambysês eagerly caught at the prospect of aid from the first naval potentate in the Ægean; upon which forty Samian triremes were sent to the Nile, having on board the suspected persons, as well as conveying a secret request to the Persian king that they might never be suffered to return. Either they never went to Egypt, however, or they found means to escape: very contradictory stories had reached Herodotus. But they certainly returned to Samos, attacked Polykrates at home, and were driven off by his superior force without making any impression. Whereupon they repaired to Sparta to entreat assistance.[2]

Polykratês breaks with Amasis king of Egypt, and allies himself with Kambysês.

We may here notice the gradually increasing tendency in the Grecian world to recognise Sparta as something like a head, protector, or referee, in cases either of foreign danger or internal dispute. The earliest authentic instance known to us, of application to Sparta in this character, is that of Crœsus against Cyrus; next, that of the Ionic Greeks against the latter: the instance of the Samians now before us is the third. The important events connected with, and consequent upon, the expulsion of the Peisistratidæ from Athens, manifesting yet more formally the headship of Sparta, occur fifteen years after the present event; they have been already recounted in a previous chapter, and serve as a farther proof of progress in the same direction. To watch the growth of these new political habits is essential to a right understanding of Grecian history.

B.C. 524.

On reaching Sparta, the Samian exiles, borne down with despondency and suffering, entered at large into the particulars of their case. Their long speaking annoyed instead of moving

[1] Herodot. iii. 44.

[2] Herodot. iii. 45.

the Spartans, who said, or are made to say—"We have forgotten the first part of the speech, and the last part is unintelligible to us". Upon which the Samians appeared the next day simply with an empty wallet, saying—"Our wallet has no meal in it". "Your wallet is superfluous" (said the Spartans); *i.e.* the words, would have been sufficient without it.[1] The aid which they implored was granted.

The Samian exiles, expelled by Polykratês, apply to Sparta for aid.

We are told that both the Lacedæmonians and the Corinthians—who joined them in the expedition now contemplated—had separate grounds of quarrel with the Samians,[2] which operated as a more powerful motive than the simple desire to aid the suffering exiles. But it rather seems that the subsequent Greeks generally construed the Lacedæmonian interference against Polykratês as an example of standing Spartan hatred against despots. Indeed the only facts which we know, to sustain this anti-despotic sentiment for which the Lacedæmonians had credit, are their proceedings against Polykratês and Hippias: there may have been other cases, but we cannot specify them with certainty. However this may be, a joint Lacedæmonian and Corinthian force accompanied the exiles back to Samos, and assailed Polykratês in the city: they did their best to capture it, for forty days, and were at one time on the point of succeeding, but were finally obliged to retire without any success. "The city would have been taken," says Herodotus, "if all the Lacedæmonians had acted like Archias and Lykôpas"—who, pressing closely upon the retreating Samians, were shut within the town-gates, and perished. The historian had heard this exploit in personal conversation with Archias, grandson of the person above-mentioned, in the deme Pitana at Sparta—whose father had been named Samius, and who respected the Samians above any other Greeks, because they had bestowed upon the two brave warriors, slain within their town, an honourable and public funeral.[3] It is rarely that Herodotus thus specifies his informants: had he done so more frequently, the value as well as the interest of his history would have been materially increased.

The Lacedæmonians attack Samos, but are repulsed.

1 Herodot. iii. 46. τῷ θυλάκῳ περιεργάσασθαι.

2 Herodot. iii. 47, 48, 52.

3 Herodot. iii. 54—56.

On the retirement of the Lacedæmonian force, the Samian exiles were left destitute; and looking out for some community to plunder, weak as well as rich, they pitched upon the island of Siphnos. The Siphnians of that day were the wealthiest islanders in the Ægean, from the productiveness of their gold and silver mines,—the produce of which was annually distributed among the citizens, reserving a tithe for the Delphian temple.[1] Their treasure chamber was among the most richly furnished of which that holy place could boast, and they themselves probably, in these times of early prosperity, were numbered among the most brilliant of the Ionic visitors at the Delian festival. The Samians, landing at Siphnos, demanded a contribution, under the name of a loan, of ten talents. Upon refusal, they proceeded to ravage the island, inflicting upon the inhabitants a severe defeat, and ultimately extorting from them 100 talents. They next purchased from the inhabitants of Hermionê in the Argolic peninsula the neighbouring island of Hydrea, famous in modern Greek warfare. Yet it appears that their plans must have been subsequently changed, for instead of occupying it, they placed it under the care of the Trœzenians, and repaired themselves to Krête, for the purpose of expelling the Zakynthian settlers at Kydônia. In this they succeeded, and were induced to establish themselves in that place: but after they had remained there five years, the Kretans obtained naval aid from Ægina, whereby the place was recovered, and the Samian intruders finally sold into slavery.[2]

Attack on Siphnos by the Samian exiles.

Such was the melancholy end of the enemies of Polykratês. Meanwhile that despot himself was more powerful and prosperous than ever. Samos under him was "the first of all cities, Hellenic or barbaric".[3] The great works admired by Herodotus in the island[4]—an aqueduct for the city, tunnelled through a mountain for the length of seven furlongs—a mole to protect the harbour, two furlongs long and twenty fathoms deep—and the vast temple of Hêrê—may probably have been enlarged and completed, if not begun, by him. Aristotle quotes the public works of Polykratês as instances

Prosperity of Polykratês.

[1] Herodot. iii. 57. *νησιωτέων μάλιστα ἐπλούτεον.*
[2] Herodot. iii. 58, 59.
[3] Herodot. iii. 139. *πολίων πασέων πρώτην Ἑλληνίδων καὶ βαρβάρων.*
[4] Herodot. iii. 60.

of the profound policy of despots, to occupy as well as to impoverish their subjects.[1] The earliest of all Grecian thalassokrats, or sea-kings—master of the greatest naval force in the Ægean, as well as of many among its islands—he displayed his love of letters by friendship to Anakreôn, and his piety by consecrating to the Delian Apollo[2] the neighbouring island of Rhêneia. But while thus outshining all his contemporaries, victorious over Sparta and Corinth, and projecting farther aggrandisement, he was precipitated on a sudden into the abyss of ruin;[3] and that too, as if to demonstrate unequivocally the agency of the envious gods, not from the revenge of any of his numerous victims, but from the gratuitous malice of a stranger whom he had never wronged and never even seen. The Persian satrap Orœtês, on the neighbouring mainland, conceived an implacable hatred against him: no one could tell why—for he had no design of attacking the island; and the trifling reasons conjecturally assigned only prove that the real reason, whatever it might be, was unknown. Availing himself of the notorious ambition and cupidity of Polykratês, Orœtês sent to Samos a messenger, pretending that his life was menaced by Kambysês, and that he was anxious to make his escape with his abundant treasures. He proposed to Polykratês a share in this treasure, sufficient to make him master of all Greece, as far as that object could be achieved by money, provided the Samian prince would come over to convey him away. Mæandrius, secretary of Polykratês, was sent over to Magnêsia on the Mæander to make inquiries. He there saw the satrap with eight large coffers full of gold—or rather apparently so, being in reality full of stones, with a layer of gold at the top,[4] tied up ready for departure. The cupidity of Polykratês was not proof against so rich a bait. He crossed over to Magnêsia with a considerable suite, and thus came into the power of Orœtês, in spite of the warnings of his prophets and the agony of his terrified daughter, to whom his approaching fate had been revealed in a dream. The satrap slew him and crucified his body;

He is slain by the Persian satrap Orœtês.

[1] Aristot. Polit. v. 9, 4. τῶν περὶ Σάμον ἔργα Πολυκράτεια· πάντα γὰρ ταῦτα δύναται ταὐτὸν, ἀσχολίαν καὶ πενίαν τῶν ἀρχομένων.

[2] Thucyd. i. 14, iii. 104.

[3] Herodot. iii. 120.

[4] Compare the trick of Hannibal at Gortyn in Krête — Cornelius Nepos, Hannibal, c. 9.

releasing all the Samians who accompanied him, with an intimation that they ought to thank him for procuring them a free government, but retaining both the foreigners and the slaves as prisoners.[1] The death of Orœtês himself, which ensued shortly afterwards, has already been described: it is considered by Herodotus as a judgment for his flagitious deed in the case of Polykratês.[2]

At the departure of the latter from Samos, in anticipation of a speedy return, Mæandrius had been left as his lieutenant at Samos; and the unexpected catastrophe of Polykratês filled him with surprise and consternation. Though possessed of the fortresses, the soldiers, and the treasures, which had constituted the machinery of his powerful master, he knew the risk of trying to employ them on his own account. Partly from this apprehension, partly from the genuine political morality which prevailed with more or less force in every Grecian bosom, he resolved to lay down his authority and enfranchise the island. "He wished (says the historian in a remarkable phrase[3]) to act like the justest of men; but he was not allowed to do so." His first proceeding was to erect in the suburbs an altar, in honour of Zeus Eleutherius, and to enclose a piece of ground as precinct, which still existed in the time of Herodotus; he next convened an assembly of the Samians. "You know (said he) that the whole power of Polykratês is now in my hands, and that there is nothing to hinder me from continuing to rule over you. Nevertheless what I condemn in another I will not do myself, and I have always disapproved of Polykratês, and others like him, for seeking to rule over men as good as themselves. Now that Polykratês has come to the end of his destiny, I at once lay down the command, and proclaim among you equal law; reserving to myself as privileges, first, six talents out of the treasures of Polykratês—next, the hereditary priesthood of Zeus Eleutherius for myself and my descendants for ever. To him I have just set apart a sacred precinct, as the God of that freedom which I now hand over to you."

Mæandrius, lieutenant of Polykratês in Samos—he desires to establish a free government after the death of Polykratês—conduct of the Samians.

[1] Herodot. iii. 124, 125.

[2] Herodot. iii. 126. Ὀροίτεα Πολυκράτεος τίσιες μετῆλθον.

[3] Herodot. iii. 142. τῷ δικαιοτάτῳ ἀνδρῶν βουλομένῳ γενέσθαι, οὐκ ἐξεγένετο. Compare his remark on Kadmus, who voluntarily resigned the despotism at Kôs (vii. 164).

This reasonable and generous proposition fully justifies the epithet of Herodotus. But very differently was it received by the Samian hearers. One of the chief men among them, Telesarchus, exclaimed with the applause of the rest, "*You* rule us, low-born and scoundrel as you are! you are not worthy to rule: don't think of that, but give us some account of the money which you have been handling".[1]

Such an unexpected reply caused a total revolution in the mind of Mæandrius. It left him no choice but to maintain dominion at all hazards, which he resolved to do. Retiring into the acropolis under pretence of preparing his money accounts for examination, he sent for Telesarchus and his chief political enemies, one by one—intimating that the accounts were open to inspection. As fast as they arrived they were put in chains, while Mæandrius remained in the acropolis, with his soldiers and his treasures, as the avowed successor of Polykratês. After a short hour of insane boastfulness, the Samians found themselves again enslaved. "It seemed (says Herodotus) that they were not willing to be free."[2]

Mæandrius becomes despot. Contrast between the Athenians and the Samians.

We cannot but contrast their conduct on this occasion with that of the Athenians about twelve years afterwards, on the expulsion of Hippias, which has been recounted in a previous chapter. The position of the Samians was far the more favourable of the two, for the quiet and successful working of a free government; since they had the advantage of a voluntary as well as a sincere resignation from the actual despot. Yet the thirst for reactionary investigation prevented them even from taking a reasonable estimate of their own power of enforcing it. They passed at once from extreme subjection to overbearing and ruinous rashness. Whereas the Athenians, under circumstances far less promising, avoided the fatal mistake of sacrificing the prospects of the future to recollections of the past; showed themselves both anxious to acquire the rights, and willing to perform the obligations, of a free community; listened to wise counsels, maintained unanimous action, and overcame by heroic effort forces very greatly superior. If we compare the reflections of

[1] Herodot. iii. 142. Ἀλλ' οὐδ' ἄξιος δώσεις τῶν μετεχείρισας χρημάτων. εἰ σύ γε ἡμέων ἄρχειν, γεγονώς τε κακὸς καὶ ἐὸν ὀλέθρος· ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον ὅκως λόγον οἴσεαι, ἐβουλέατο εἶναι ἐλεύθεροι.

[2] Herodot. iii. 143. οὐ γὰρ δὴ, ὡς

Herodotus on the one case and on the other,[1] we shall be struck with the difference which those reflections imply between the Athenians and the Samians—a difference partly referable, doubtless, to the pure Hellenism of the former, contrasted with the half-Asiatised Hellenism of the latter, but also traceable in a great degree to the preliminary lessons of the Solonian constitution, overlaid, but not extinguished, during the despotism of the Peisistratids which followed.

The events which succeeded in Samos are little better than a series of crimes and calamities. The prisoners, whom Mæandrius had detained in the acropolis, were slain during his dangerous illness, by his brother Lykarêtus, under the idea that this would enable him more easily to seize the sceptre. But Mæandrius recovered, and must have continued as despot for a year or two. It was however a weak despotism, contested more or less in the island, and very different from the iron hand of Polykratês. In this untoward condition the Samians were surprised by the arrival of a new claimant for their sceptre and acropolis, and, what was much more formidable, a Persian army to back him.

Sylosôn, brother of Polykratês, lands with a Persian army in Samos—his history.

Sylosôn the brother of Polykratês, having taken part originally in his brother's conspiracy and usurpation, had been at first allowed to share the fruits of it, but quickly found himself banished. In this exile he remained during the whole life of Polykratês, and until the accession of Darius to the Persian throne, which followed about a year after the death of Polykratês. He happened to be at Memphis in Egypt during the time when Kambysês was there with his conquering army, and when Darius, then a Persian of little note, was serving among his guards. Sylosôn was walking in the agora of Memphis, wearing a scarlet cloak, to which Darius took a great fancy, and proposed to buy it. A divine inspiration prompted Sylosôn to reply,[2] "I cannot for any price sell it; but I give it you for nothing, if it must be yours". Darius thanked him and accepted the cloak; and for some years the donor accused himself of a silly piece of good nature.[3] But as events came round, Sylosôn at length heard with surprise

[1] Herodot. v. 78, and iii. 142, 143.

[2] Herodot. iii. 139. Ὁ δὲ Συλοσῶν, ὁρέων τὸν Δαρεῖον μεγάλως ἐπιθυμέοντα τῆς χλάνιδος, θείῃ τύχῃ χρεώμενος, λέγει.

[3] Herodot. iii. 140. ηπίστατό οἱ τοῦτο ἀπολωλέναι δι' εὐηθίην.

that the unknown Persian, whom he had presented with the cloak at Memphis, was installed as king in the palace at Susa. He went thither, proclaimed himself as a Greek, the benefactor of the new king, and was admitted to the regal presence. Darius had forgotten his person, but perfectly remembered the adventure of the cloak, when it was brought to his mind—and showed himself forward to requite, on the scale becoming the Great King, former favours, though small, rendered to the simple soldier at Memphis. Gold and silver were tendered to Sylosôn in profusion, but he rejected them—requesting that the island of Samos might be conquered and handed over to him, without slaughter or enslavement of inhabitants. His request was complied with. Otanês, the originator of the conspiracy against Smerdis, was sent down to the coast of Ionia with an army, carried Sylosôn over to Samos, and landed him unexpectedly on the island.[1]

Mæandrius was in no condition to resist the invasion, nor were the Samians generally disposed to sustain him. He accordingly concluded a convention with Otanês, whereby he agreed to make way for Sylosôn, to evacuate the island, and to admit the Persians at once into the city; retaining possession, however, for such time as might be necessary to embark his property and treasures, of the acropolis, which had a separate landing-place, and even a subterranean passage and secret portal for embarkation—probably one of the precautionary provisions of Polykratês. Otanês willingly granted these conditions, and himself with his principal officers entered the town, the army being quartered around; while Sylosôn seemed on the point of ascending the seat of his deceased brother without violence or bloodshed. But the Samians were destined to a fate more calamitous. Mæandrius had a brother named Charilaus, violent in his temper and half a madman, whom he was obliged to keep in confinement. This man, looking out of his chamber-window, saw the Persian officers seated peaceably throughout the town and even under the gates of the acropolis, unguarded, and relying upon the convention: it seems that these were the chief officers whose rank gave them the privilege of being carried about on their seats.[2] The sight inflamed both his

Mæandrius agrees to evacuate the island.

1 Herodot. iii. 141—144.

2 Herodot. iii. 146. τῶν Περσέων τοὺς διφροφορευμένους τε καὶ λόγου πλεόστου ἐόντας.

wrath and his insane ambition. He clamoured for liberty and admission to his brother, whom he reviled as a coward no less than a tyrant. "Here are you, worthless man, keeping me, your own brother, in a dungeon, though I have done no wrong worthy of bonds; while you do not dare to take your revenge on the Persians, who are casting you out as a houseless exile, and whom it would be so easy to put down. If you are afraid of them, give me your guards; I will make the Persians repent of their coming here, and I will send you safely out of the island forthwith."[1]

Mæandrius, on the point of quitting Samos for ever, had little personal motive to care what became of the population. He had probably never forgiven them for disappointing his honourable intentions after the death of Polykratês, nor was he displeased to hand over to Sylosôn an odious and blood-stained sceptre, which he foresaw would be the only consequence of his brother's mad project. He therefore sailed away with his treasures, leaving the acropolis to his brother Charilaus; who immediately armed the guards, sallied forth from his fortress, and attacked the unsuspecting Persians. Many of the great officers were slain without resistance before the army could be got together; but at length Otanês collected his troops and drove the assailants back into the acropolis. While he immediately began the siege of that fortress, he also resolved, as Mæandrius had foreseen, to take a signal revenge for the treacherous slaughter of so many of his friends and companions. His army, no less incensed than himself, were directed to fall upon the Samian people and massacre them without discrimination—man and boy, on ground sacred as well as profane. The bloody order was too faithfully executed, and Samos was handed over to Sylosôn, stripped of its male inhabitants.[2] Of Charilaus and the acropolis we hear no farther: perhaps he and his guards may have escaped by sea. Lykarêtus,[3] the other brother of Mæandrius, must have remained either in the service of Sylosôn or in that of the Persians; for we find him

Many Persian officers slain—slaughter of the Samians.

[1] Herodot. iii. 145. Ἐμὲ μεν, ὦ κάκιστε ἀνδρῶν, ἐόντα σεωυτοῦ ἀδελφεον, καὶ ἀδικήσαντα οὐδὲν ἄξιον δεσμοῦ, δήσας γοργύρης ἠξίωσας· ὀρέων δὲ τοὺς Πέρσας ἐκβάλλοντάς τέ σε καὶ ἄνοικον ποιεῦντας, οὐ τολμᾷς τίσασθαι, οὕτω δή τι ἐόντας εὐπετέας χειρωθῆναι.

The highly dramatic manner of Herodotus cannot be melted down into smooth historical recital.

[2] Herodot. iii. 139. ἔρημον ἐοῦσαν ἀνδρῶν.

[3] Herodot. v. 27.

some years afterwards entrusted by the latter with an important command.

Sylosôn was thus finally installed as despot of an island peopled chiefly, if not wholly, with women and children: we may however presume that the deed of blood has been described by the historian as more sweeping than it really was. It seems nevertheless to have sat heavily on the conscience of Otanês, who was induced some time afterwards, by a dream and by a painful disease, to take measures for repeopling the island.[1] From whence the new population came, we are not told; but wholesale translations of inhabitants from one place to another were familiar to the mind of a Persian king or satrap.

Sylosôn despot at Samos.

Mæandrius, following the example of the previous Samian exiles under Polykratês, went to Sparta and sought aid for the purpose of re-establishing himself at Samos. But the Lacedæmonians had no disposition to repeat an attempt which had before turned out so unsuccessfully, nor could he seduce king Kleomenês by the display of his treasures and finely-wrought gold plate. The king, however, not without fear that such seductions might win over some of the Spartan leading men, prevailed with the ephors to send Mæandrius away.

Application of Mæandrius to Sparta for aid—refused.

Sylosôn seems to have remained undisturbed at Samos, as a tributary of Persia, like the Ionic cities on the continent; some years afterwards we find his son Æakês reigning in the island.[2] Strabo states that it was the harsh rule of Sylosôn which caused the depopulation of the island. But the cause just recounted out of Herodotus is both very different and sufficiently plausible in itself; and as Strabo seems in the main to have derived his account from Herodotus, we may suppose that on this point he has incorrectly remembered his authority.[4]

[1] Herodot. iii. 149.
[2] Herodot. iii. 148.
[3] Herodot. vi. 13.
[4] Strabo, xiv. p. 638. He gives a proverbial phrase about the depopulation of the island—

Ἔκητι Συλοσῶντος εὐρυχωρίη,

which is perfectly consistent with the narrative of Herodotus.

# CHAPTER XXXIV.

## DÊMOKÊDÊS.—DARIUS INVADES SCYTHIA.

DARIUS had now acquired full authority throughout the Persian empire, having put down the refractory satrap Orœtês, as well as the revolted Medes and Babylonians. He had moreover completed the conquest of Ionia, by the important addition of Samos; and his dominion thus comprised all Asia Minor with its neighbouring islands. But this was not sufficient for the ambition of a Persian king, next but one in succession to the great Cyrus. The conquering impulse was yet unabated among the Persians, who thought it incumbent upon their king, and whose king thought it incumbent upon himself, to extend the limits of the empire. Though not of the lineage of Cyrus, Darius had taken pains to connect himself with it by marriage: he had married Atossa and Artystonê, daughters of Cyrus—and Parmys, daughter of Smerdis the younger son of Cyrus. Atossa had been first the wife of her brother Kambysês; next, of the Magian Smerdis his successor; and thirdly of Darius, to whom she bore four children.[1] Of those children the eldest was Xerxês, respecting whom more will be said hereafter.

Conquering disposition of Darius.

Atossa, mother of the only Persian king who ever set foot in Greece—the Sultana Validi of Persia during the reign of Xerxês—was a person of commanding influence in the reign of her last husband,[2] as well as in that of her son, and filled no inconsiderable space even in Grecian imagination, as we may see both by Æschylus and Herodotus. Had

Influence of his wife Atossa.

[1] Herodot. iii. 88, vii. 2.

[2] Herodot. vii. 3. ἡ γὰρ Ἄτοσσα εἶχε τὸ πᾶν κράτος. Compare the description given of the ascendency of the savage Sultana Parysatis over her son Artaxerxês Mnêmôn (Plutarch, Artaxerxês, c. 16. 19, 23).

her influence prevailed, the first conquering appetites of Darius would have been directed not against the steppes of Scythia, but against Attica and Peloponnêsus; at least so Herodotus assures us. The grand object of that historian is to set forth the contentions of Hellas with the barbarians or non-Hellenic world. Accordingly with an art truly epical, which manifests itself everywhere to the careful reader of his nine books, he preludes to the real dangers which were averted at Marathôn and Platæa by recounting the first conception of an invasion of Greece by the Persians—how it originated and how it was abandoned. For this purpose—according to his historical style, wherein general facts are set forth as subordinate and explanatory accompaniments to the adventures of particular persons—he gives us the interesting but romantic history of the Krotoniate surgeon Dêmokêdês.

Dêmokêdês—the Krotoniate surgeon—his adventures—he is carried as a slave to Susa.

Dêmokêdês, son of a citizen of Krotôn named Kalliphôn, had turned his attention in early youth to the study and practice of medicine and surgery (for that age, we can make no difference between the two) and had made considerable progress in it. His youth coincides nearly with the arrival of Pythagoras at Krotôn (550—520); a time when the science of the surgeon as well as the art of the gymnastic trainer were prosecuted in that city more actively than in any part of Greece. Kalliphôn, the father of Dêmokêdês, was a man of such severe temper, that the son ran away from him and resolved to maintain himself by his talents elsewhere. Retiring to Ægina, he there began to practise in his profession. So rapid was his success even in the first year—though very imperfectly equipped with instruments and apparatus[1]—that the citizens of the island made a contract

[1] Herodot. iii. 131. ἀσκευὴς περ ἐὼν, καὶ ἔχων οὐδὲν τῶν ὅσα περὶ τὴν τέχνην ἐστὶ ἐργαλήϊα—the description refers to surgical rather than to medical practice.

That curious assemblage of the cases of particular patients with remarks, known in the works of Hippokratês under the title Ἐπιδήμιαι (Notes of visits to different cities), is very illustrative of what Herodotus here mentions about Dêmokêdês. Consult also the valuable Prolegomena of M. Littré, in his edition of Hippokratês, as to the character, means of action, and itinerant habits of the Grecian ἰατροί; see particularly the preface to vol. v. p. 12, where he enumerates the various places visited and noted by Hippokratês. The greater number of the Hippokratic observations refer to various parts of Thrace, Macedonia, and Thessaly; but there are some also which refer to patients in the islands of Syros and Dêlos, at Athens, Salamis, Elis, Corinth, and Œniadæ in Akar-

with him to remain there for one year, at a salary of one talent (about £383 sterling, an Æginæan talent). The year afterwards he was invited to come to Athens, then under the Peisistratids, at a salary of 100 minæ or 1⅔ talent; and in the following year, Polykratês of Samos tempted him by the offer of two talents. With that despot he remained, and accompanied him in his last calamitous visit to the satrap Orœtês; on the murder of Polykratês, being seized among the slaves and foreign attendants, he was left to languish with the rest in imprisonment and neglect. When again, soon after, Orœtês himself was slain, Dêmokêdês was numbered among his slaves and chattels, and sent up to Susa.

He had not been long at that capital, when Darius, leaping from his horse in the chase, sprained his foot badly, and was carried home in violent pain. The Egygtian surgeons, supposed to be the first men in their profession,[1] whom he habitually employed, did him no good, but only aggravated his torture. For seven days and nights he had no sleep, and he as well as those around him began to despair. At length some one who had been at Sardis accidentally recollected that he had heard of

nania. "On voit par là combien étoit juste le nom de Periodeutes ou voyageurs donnés à ces anciens médecins."

Again, M. Littré, in the same preface, p. 25, illustrates the proceedings and residence of the ancient *ἰατρός*—"On se tromperoit si on se représentoit la demeure d'un médecin d'alors, comme celle d'un médecin d'aujourd'hui. La maison du médecin de l'antiquité, du moins au temps d'Hippocrate et aux époques voisines, renfermoit un local destiné à la pratique d'un grand nombre d'opérations, contenant les machines et les instrumens nécessaires, et de plus étant aussi une boutique de pharmacie. Ce local se nommait *ἰατρεῖον*." See Plato, Legg. i. p. 646, iv. p. 720. Timæus accused Aristotle of having begun as a surgeon, practising to great profit in surgery or *ἰατρεῖον*, and having quitted this occupation late in life to devote himself to the study of science —*σοφιστὴν ὑψιμαθῆ καὶ μισητὸν ὑπάρχοντα, καὶ τὸ πολυτίμητον ἰατρεῖον ἀρτίως ἀποκεκλεικότα* (Polyb. xii. 9).

See also the Remarques Rétrospectives attached by M. Littré to volume iv. of the same work (p. 654—658), where he dwells upon the intimate union of surgical and medical practice in antiquity. At the same time, it must be remarked that a passage in the remarkable medical oath, published in the collection of Hippokratic treatises, recognises in the plainest manner the distinction between the physician and the operator—the former binds himself by this oath not to perform the operation "even of ...tomy, but to leave it to the operators or workmen": *Οὐ τεμέω δὲ οὐδὲ μὴν λιθιῶντας ἐγχωρήσω δὲ ἐργάτῃσιν ἀνδράσι πρήξιος τῆσδε* (Œuvres d'Hippocrate, vol. iv. p. 630, ed. Littré). M. Littré (p. 617) contests this explanation, remarking that the various Hippokratic treatises represent the *ἰατρός* as performing all sorts of operations, even such as require violent and mechanical dealing. But the words of the oath are so explicit, that it seems more reasonable to assign to the oath itself a later date than the treatises, when the habits of practitioners may have changed.

[1] About the Persian habit of sending to Egypt for surgeons, compare Herodot. iii. 1.

a Greek surgeon among the slaves of Orœtês. Search was immediately made, and the miserable slave was brought, in chains as well as in rags,[1] into the presence of the royal sufferer. Being asked whether he understood surgery, he affected ignorance; but Darius, suspecting this to be a mere artifice, ordered out the scourge and the pricking instrument to overcome it. Dêmokêdês now saw that there was no resource, admitted that he had acquired some little skill, and was called upon to do his utmost in the case before him. He was fortunate enough to succeed perfectly, in alleviating the pain, in procuring sleep for the exhausted patient, and ultimately in restoring the foot to a sound state. Darius, who had abandoned all hopes of such a cure, knew no bounds to his gratitude. As a first reward, he presented him with two sets of chains in solid gold—a commemoration of the state in which Dêmokêdês had first come before him. He next sent him into the harem to visit his wives. The conducting eunuchs introduced him as the man who had restored the king to life, upon which the grateful sultanas each gave to him a saucer full of golden coins called statêrs;[2] in all so numerous, that the slave Skitôn who followed him was enriched by merely picking up the pieces which dropped on the floor. This was not all. Darius gave him a splendid house and furniture, made him the companion of his table, and showed him every description of favour. He was about to crucify the Egyptian surgeons who had been so unsuccessful in their attempts to cure him. But Dêmokêdês had the happiness of preserving their lives, as well as of rescuing an unfortunate companion of his imprisonment—an Eleian prophet, who had followed the fortunes of Polykratês.

He cures Darius, who rewards him munificently.

But there was one favour which Darius would on no account grant; yet upon this one Dêmokêdês had set his heart—the liberty of returning to Greece. At length accident, combined with his own surgical skill, enabled him to escape from the

[1] Herodot. iii. 129. *τὸν δὲ ὡς ἐξεῦρον ἐν τοῖσι Ὀροίτεω ἀνδραπόδοισι ὄκου δὴ ἀπημελημένον, παρῆγον ἐς μέσον, πέδας τε ἕλκοντα καὶ ῥάκεσι ἐσθημένον.*

[2] Herodot. iii. 130. The golden statêr was equal to about £1 1*s.* 3*d.* English money (Hussey, Ancient Weights, vii. 3, p. 103).

The ladies in a Persian harem appear to have been less unapproachable and invisible than those in modern Turkey; in spite of the observation of Plutarch, Artaxerxês, c. 27.

splendour of his second detention, as it had before extricated him from the misery of the first. A tumour formed upon the breast of Atossa: at first she said nothing to any one, but it became too bad for concealment, and she was forced to consult Dêmokêdês. He promised to cure her, but required from her a solemn oath that she would afterwards do for him anything which he should ask—pledging himself at the same time to ask nothing indecent.[1] The cure was successful, and Atossa was required to repay it by procuring his liberty. Knowing that the favour would be refused, even to her, if directly solicited, he taught her a stratagem for obtaining under false pretences the consent of Darius. She took an early opportunity (Herodotus tells us,[2] in bed) of reminding Darius that the Persians expected from him some positive addition to the power and splendour of the empire; and when Darius, in answer, acquainted her that he contemplated a speedy expedition against the Scythians, she entreated him to postpone it and to turn his forces first against Greece—"I have heard (she said) about the maidens of Sparta, Athens, Argos, and Corinth, and I want to have some of them as slaves to serve me—(we may conceive the smile of triumph with which the sons of those who had conquered at Platæa and Salamis would hear this part of the history read by Herodotus)—you have near you the best person possible to give information about Greece—that Greek who cured your foot". Darius was induced by this request to send some confidential Persians into Greece to procure information, along with Dêmokêdês. Selecting fifteen of them, he ordered them to survey the coasts and cities of Greece, under guidance of Dêmokêdês, but with peremptory orders upon no account to let him escape or to return without him. He next sent for Dêmokêdês himself, explained to him what he wanted, and enjoined him imperatively to return as soon as the business had been completed. He farther desired him to carry away all the ample donations which he had already received, as presents to his father and brothers, promising that on his return

He procures permission, by artifice and through the influence of Atossa, to return to Greece.

[1] Herodot. iii. 133. δεήσεσθαι δὲ οὐδενὸς τῶν ὅσα αἰσχύνην ἐστὶ φέροντα. Another Greek physician at the court of Susa, about seventy years afterwards—Apollonidês of Kôs—in attendance on a Persian princess, did not impose upon himself the same restraint: his intrigue was divulged, and he was put to death miserably (Ktêsias, Persica, c. 42).

[2] Herodot. iii. 134.

fresh donations of equal value should make up the loss. Lastly, he directed that a store-ship, "filled with all manner of good things," should accompany the voyage. Dêmokêdês undertook the mission with every appearance of sincerity. The better to play his part, he declined to take away what he already possessed at Susa—saying, that he should like to find his property and furniture again on coming back, and that the store-ship alone, with its contents, would be sufficient both for the voyage and for all necessary presents.

Atossa suggests to Darius an expedition against Greece—Dêmokêdês with some Persians is sent to procure information for him.

Accordingly he and the fifteen Persian envoys went down to Sidon in Phœnicia, where two armed triremes were equipped, with a large store-ship in company. The voyage of survey into Greece was commenced. They visited and examined all the principal places in Greece —probably beginning with the Asiatic and insular Greeks, crossing to Eubœa, circumnavigating Attica and Peloponnêsus, then passing to Korkyra and Italy. They surveyed the coasts and cities, taking memoranda[1] of everything worthy of note which they saw. Such a Periplûs, if it had been preserved, would have been inestimable, as an account of the actual state of the Grecian world about 518 B.C. As soon as they arrived at Tarentum, Dêmokêdês—now within a short distance of his own home, Krotôn—found an opportunity of executing what he had meditated from the beginning. At his request, Aristophilidês the king of Tarentum seized the fifteen Persians and detained them as spies, at the same time taking the rudders from off their ships—while Dêmokêdês himself made his escape to Krotôn. As soon as he had arrived there, Aristophilidês released the Persians; who, pursuing their voyage, went on to Krotôn, found Dêmokêdês in the market-place, and laid hands upon him. But his fellow-citizens rescued him, not without opposition from some who were afraid of provoking the Great King—and in spite of remonstrances, energetic and menacing, from the Persians themselves. Indeed the Krotôniates not only protected the restored exile, but even robbed the Persians of their store-ship. The latter, disabled from proceeding farther as well by this loss as by the secession of Dêmokêdês, commenced

[1] Herodot. iii. 136. προσίσχοντες δὲ αὐτῆς τὰ παραθαλάσσια ἐθηεῦντο καὶ ἀπεγράφοντο.

their voyage homeward, but unfortunately suffered shipwreck near the Iapygian cape, and became slaves in that neighbourhood. A Tarentine exile, named Gillus, ransomed them and carried them up to Susa—a service for which Darius promised him any recompense that he chose. Restoration to his native city was all that Gillus asked; and that too, not by force, but by the mediation of the Asiatic Greeks of Knidus, who were on terms of intimate alliance with the Tarentines. This generous citizen—an honourable contrast to Dêmokêdês, who had not scrupled to impel the stream of Persian conquest against his country, in order to procure his own release—was unfortunately disappointed of his anticipated recompense. For though the Knidians, at the injunction of Darius, employed all their influence at Tarentum to procure a revocation of the sentence of exile, they were unable to succeed, and force was out of the question.[1] The last words addressed by Dêmokêdês at parting to his Persian companions, exhorted them to acquaint Darius that he (Dêmokêdês) was about to marry the daughter of the Krotôniate Milo—one of the first men in Krotôn as well as the greatest wrestler of his time. The reputation of Milo was very great with Darius—probably from the talk of Dêmokêdês himself: moreover gigantic muscular force could be appreciated by men who had no relish either for Homer or Solôn. And thus did this clever and vain-glorious Greek, sending back his fifteen Persian companions to disgrace and perhaps to death, deposit in their parting ears a braggart message, calculated to create for himself a factitious name at Susa. He paid a large sum to Milo as the price of his daughter, for this very purpose.[2]

Voyage of Dêmokêdês along the coast of Greece—he stays at Krotôn—fate of his Persian companions.

Consequences which might have been expected to happen if Darius had then undertaken his expedition against Greece.

Thus finishes the history of Dêmokêdês, and of the "first Persians (to use the phrase of Herodotus) who ever came over from Asia into Greece".[3] It is a history well deserving of attention, even looking only to the liveliness of the incidents, introducing us as they do into the full movement of the ancient world—inci-

[1] Herodot. iii. 137, 138.

[2] Herodot. iii. 137. κατὰ δὴ τοῦτό μοι δοκέει σπεῦσαι τὸν γάμον τοῦτον τελέσας χρήματα μεγάλα Δημοκήδης, ἵνα φανῇ πρὸς Δαρείου ἐὼν καὶ ἐν τῇ ἑωϋτοῦ δόκιμος.

[3] Herodot. iii. 138.

dents which I see no reason for doubting, with a reasonable allowance for the dramatic amplification of the historian. Even at that early date, Greek medical intelligence stands out in a surpassing manner, and Dêmokêdês is the first of those many able Greek surgeons who were seized, carried up to Susa,[1] and there detained for the Great King, his court, and harem.

But his history suggests in another point of view far more serious reflections. Like the Milesian Histiæus (of whom I shall speak hereafter), he cared not what amount of risk he brought upon his country in order to procure his own escape from a splendid detention at Susa. Now the influence which he originated was on the point of precipitating upon Greece the whole force of the Persian empire, at a time when Greece was in no condition to resist it. Had the first aggressive expedition of Darius, with his own personal command and fresh appetite for conquest, been directed against Greece instead of against Scythia (between 516—514 B.C.), Grecian independence would have perished almost infallibly. For Athens was then still governed by the Peisistratids. What she was under them, we have had occasion to notice in a former chapter. She had then no courage for energetic self-defence, and probably Hippias himself, far from offering resistance, would have found it advantageous to accept Persian dominion as a means of strengthening his own rule, like the Ionian despots. Moreover, Grecian habit of co-operation was then only just commencing. But fortunately the Persian invader did not touch the shore of Greece until more than twenty years afterwards, in 490 B.C.; and during that precious interval, the Athenian character had undergone the memorable revolution which has been before described. Their energy and their organisation had been alike improved, and their force of resistance had become decupled;

[1] Xenophôn, Memorab. iv. 2, 33. Ἄλλους δὲ πόσους οἶει (says Sokratês) διὰ σοφίαν ἀναρπάστους πρὸς βασιλέα γεγονέναι, καὶ ἐκεῖ δουλεύειν;

We shall run little risk in conjecturing that among the intelligent and able men thus carried off, surgeons and physicians would be selected as the first and most essential.

Apollonidês of Kôs (whose calamitous end has been alluded to in a previous note) was resident as surgeon or physician with Artaxerxês Longimanus (Ktêsias, Persica, c. 30), and Polykritus of Mendê, as well as Ktêsias himself, with Artaxerxês Mnêmôn (Plutarch, Artaxerxês, c. 31).

besides which their conduct had so provoked the Persian that resistance was then a matter of necessity with them, and submission on tolerable terms an impossibility. When we come to the grand Persian invasion of Greece, we shall see that Athens was the life and soul of all the opposition offered. We shall see farther, that with all the efforts of Athens, the success of the defence was more than once doubtful; and would have been converted into a very different result if Xerxês had listened to the best of his own counsellors. But had Darius—at the head of the very same force which he conducted into Scythia, or even an inferior force—landed at Marathôn in 514 B.C., instead of sending Datis in 490 B.C., he would have found no men like the victors of Marathôn to meet him. As far as we can appreciate the probabilities, he would have met with little resistance except from the Spartans singly, who would have maintained their own very defensible territory against all his efforts, like the Mysians and Pisidians in Asia Minor, or like the Mainots of Laconia in later days; but Hellas generally would have become a Persian satrapy. Fortunately, Darius, while bent on invading some country, had set his mind on the attack of Scythia, alike perilous and unprofitable. His personal ardour was wasted on those unconquerable regions, where he narrowly escaped the disastrous fate of Cyrus—nor did he ever pay a second visit to the coasts of the Ægean. Yet the amorous influences of Atossa, set at work by Dêmokêdês, might well have been sufficiently powerful to induce Darius to assail Greece instead of Scythia—a choice in favour of which all other recommendations concurred; and the history of free Greece would then probably have stopped at this point, without unrolling any of the glories which followed. So incalculably great has been the influence of Grecian development, during the two centuries between 500—300 B.C., on the destinies of mankind, that we cannot pass without notice a contingency which threatened to arrest that development in the bud. Indeed it may be remarked that the history of any nation, considered as a sequence of causes and effects affording applicable knowledge, requires us to study not merely real events, but also imminent contingencies—events which were on the point of occurring, but yet did not occur. When we read the wailings of Atossa in the Persæ of Æschylus, for the humiliation which her

son Xerxês had just undergone in his flight from Greece,[1] we do not easily persuade ourselves to reverse the picture, and to conceive the same Atossa twenty years earlier, numbering as her slaves at Susa the noblest Herakleid and Alkmæônid maidens from Greece. Yet the picture would really have been thus reversed—the wish of Atossa would have been fulfilled and the wailings would have been heard from enslaved Greek maidens in Persia—if the mind of Darius had not happened to be pre-occupied with a project not less insane even than those of Kambysês against Ethiopia and the Libyan desert. Such at least is the moral of the story of Dêmokêdês.

That insane expedition across the Danube into Scythia comes now to be recounted. It was undertaken by Darius for the purpose of avenging the inroad and devastation of the Scythians in Media and Upper Asia, about a century before. The lust of conquest imparted unusual force to this sentiment of wounded dignity, which in the case of the Scythians could hardly be connected with any expectation of plunder or profit. In spite of the dissuading admonition of his brother Artabanus,[2] Darius summoned the whole force of his empire, army and navy, to the Thracian Bosphorus—a force not less than 700,000 horse and

About 516—515 B.C.

Darius marches against Scythia.

[1] Æschyl. Pers. 435—845, &c.

[2] Herodot. iv. 1, 83. There is nothing to mark the precise year of the Scythian expedition; but as the accession of Darius is fixed to 521 B.C., and as the expedition is connected with the early part of his reign, we may conceive him to have entered upon it as soon as his hands were free; that is, as soon as he had put down the revolted satraps and provinces, Orœtês, the Medes, Babylonians, &c. Five years seems a reasonable time to allow for these necessities of the empire, which would bring the Scythian expedition to 516—515 B.C. There is reason for supposing it to have been before 514 B.C., for in that year Hipparchus was slain at Athens, and Hippias the surviving brother, looking out for securities and alliances abroad, gave his daughter in marriage to Æantidês son of Hippoklus despot of Lampsakus, "perceiving that Hippoklus and his son had great influence with Darius" (Thucyd. vi. 59). Now Hippoklus could not well have acquired this influence *before* the Scythian expedition; for Darius came down then for the first time to the western sea: Hippoklus served upon that expedition (Herodot. iv. 138), and it was probably then that his favour was acquired, and farther confirmed during the time that Darius stayed at Sardis after his return from Scythia.

Professor Schultz (Beiträge zu genaueren Zeitbestimmungen der Hellen. Geschichte von der 63. bis zur 72. Olympiade, p. 168, in the Kieler Philolog. Studien) places the expedition in 513 B.C.; but I think a year or two earlier is more probable. Larcher, Wesseling, and Bahr (ad Herodot. iv. 145) place it in 508 B.C. which is later than the truth; indeed Larcher himself places the reduction of Lêmnos and Imbros by Otanês in 511 B.C., though that event decidedly came after the Scythian expedition (Herodot. v. 27; Larcher, Table Chronologique, Trad. d'Hérodot. t. vii. p. 633—635).

foot, and 600 ships, according to Herodotus. On these prodigious numbers we can lay no stress. But it appears that the names of all the various nations composing the host were inscribed on two pillars, erected by order of Darius on the European side of the Bosphorus, and afterwards seen by Herodotus himself in the city of Byzantium — the inscriptions were bilingual, in Assyrian characters as well as Greek. The Samian architect Mandroklês had been directed to throw a bridge of boats across the Bosphorus, about half-way between Byzantium and the mouth of the Euxine. So peremptory were the Persian kings that their orders for military service should be punctually obeyed, and so impatient were they of the idea of exemptions, that when a Persian father named Œobazus entreated that one of his three sons, all included in the conscription, might be left at home, Darius replied that all three of them should be left at home—an answer which the unsuspecting father heard with delight. They were indeed all left at home—for they were all put to death.[1] A proceeding similar to this is ascribed afterwards to Xerxês;[2] whether true or not as matters of fact, they illustrate the wrathful displeasure with which the Persian kings were known to receive such petitions for exemption.

The naval force of Darius seems to have consisted entirely of subject Greeks, Asiatic and insular; for the Phœnician fleet was not brought into the Ægean until the subsequent Ionic revolt. At this time all or most of the Asiatic Greek cities were under despots, who leaned on the Persian government for support, and who appeared with their respective contingents to take part in the Scythian expedition.[3] Of Ionic Greeks were seen—Strattis, despot of Chios; Æakês son of Sylosôn, despot of Samos; Laodamas, of Phôkæa; and Histiæus, of Milêtus. From the Æolic towns, Aristagoras of Kymê; from the Hellespontine Greeks, Daphnis of Abydus, Hippoklus of Lampsakus, Hêrophantus of Parium, Metrodôrus of Prokonnêsus, Aristagoras of Kyzikus, and Miltiadês of the Thracian Chersonese—all these are mentioned, and there were probably more. This large fleet, assembled at the Bosphorus, was sent forward into the Euxine

His naval force formed of Asiatic and insular Greeks.

1 Herodot. iv. 84. 2 Herodot. vii. 39 3 Herodot. iv. 97, 137, 138.

to the mouth of the Danube—with orders to sail up the river two days' journey, above the point where its channel begins to divide, and to throw a bridge of boats over it. Darius, having liberally recompensed the architect Mandroklês, crossed the bridge over the Bosphorus, and began his march through Thrace, receiving the submission of various Thracian tribes in his way, and subduing others—especially the Getæ north of Mount Hæmus, who were compelled to increase still farther the numbers of his vast army.[1] On arriving at the Danube, he found the bridge finished and prepared for his passage by the Ionians. We may remark here, as on so many other occasions, that all operations requiring intelligence are performed for the Persians either by Greeks or by Phœnicians—more usually by the former. He crossed this greatest of all earthly rivers[2]—for so the Danube was imagined to be in the fifth century B.C.—and directed his march into Scythia.

He directs the Greeks to throw a bridge over the Danube and crosses the river.

As far as the point now attained, our narrative runs smoothly and intelligibly: we know that Darius marched his army into Scythia, and that he came back with ignominy and severe loss. But as to all which happened between his crossing and recrossing the Danube, we find nothing approaching to authentic statement, nor even what we can set forth as the probable basis of truth on which exaggerating fancy has been at work—all is inexplicable mystery. Ktêsias indeed says that Darius marched for fifteen days into the Scythian territory—that he then exchanged bows with the king of Scythia and discovered the Scythian bow to be the largest—and that being intimidated by such discovery, he fled back to the bridge by which he had crossed the Danube, and recrossed the river with the loss of one-tenth part of his army,[3] being compelled to break down the bridge

[1] Herodot. iv. 89—98.

[2] Herodot. iv. 48—50. Ἴστρος—μέγιστος ποταμῶν πάντων τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν, &c.

[3] Ktêsias, Persica, c. 17. Justin (ii. 5—compare also xxxviii. 7) seems to follow the narrative of Ktêsias.

Æschylus (Persæ, 864), who presents the deceased Darius as a glorious contrast with the living Xerxês, talks of the splendid conquests which he made by means of others—"without crossing the Halys himself, nor leaving his home". We are led to suppose, by the language which Æschylus puts into the mouth of the Eidôlon of Darius (v. 720—745), that he had forgotten the bridge thrown across the Bosphorus by order of Darius; for the latter is made to condemn severely the impious insolence of Xerxês in bridging over the Hellespont.

before all had passed. The length of march is here the only thing distinctly stated; about the direction nothing is said; but the narrative of Ktêsias, defective as it is, is much less perplexing than that of Herodotus, who conducts the immense host of Darius as it were through fairyland—heedless of distance, large intervening rivers, want of all cultivation or supplies, destruction of the country (in so far as it could be destroyed) by the retreating Scythians, &c. He tells us that the Persian army consisted chiefly of foot—that there were no roads nor agriculture; yet his narrative carries it over about twelve degrees of longitude from the Danube to the country east of the Tanais, across the rivers Tyras (Dniester), Hypanis (Bog), Borysthenês (Dnieper), Hypakyris, Gerrhos, and Tanais.[1] How these rivers could have been passed in the face of enemies by so vast a host, we are left to conjecture, since it was not winter-time to convert them into ice: nor does the historian even allude to them as having been crossed either in the advance or in the retreat. What is not less remarkable is that, in respect to the Greek settlement of Olbia or Borysthenês, and the agricultural Scythians and Mix-hellenes between the Hypanis and Borysthenês, across whose country it would seem that this march of Darius must have carried him—Herodotus does not say anything; though we should have expected that he would have had better means of informing himself about this part of the march than about any other, and though the Persians could hardly have failed to plunder or put in requisition this, the only productive portion of Scythia.

He marches into Scythia—narrative of his march impossible and unintelligible, considered as history.

The narrative of Herodotus in regard to the Persian march north of the Ister seems indeed destitute of all the conditions of reality. It is rather an imaginative description, illustrating the desperate and impracticable character of Scythian warfare, and

[1] Herodot, iv. 136. *ἅτε δὲ τοῦ Περσικοῦ μὲν τοῦ πολλοῦ ἐόντος πεζοῦ στρατοῦ, καὶ τὰς ὁδοὺς οὐκ ἐπισταμένου, ὥστε οὐ τετμημένων τῶν ὁδῶν, τοῦ δὲ Σκυθικοῦ, ἱππότεω, καὶ τὰ σύντομα τῆς ὁδοῦ ἐπισταμένου*, &c. Compare c. 128. The number and size of the rivers are mentioned by Herodotus as the principal wonder of Scythia, c. 82—*Θωϋμάσια δὲ ἡ χώρη αὕτη οὐκ ἔχει, χωρὶς ἢ ὅτι ποταμούς τε πολλῷ μεγίστους καὶ ἀριθμὸν πλείστους*, &c. He ranks the Borysthenês as the largest of all rivers except the Nile and the Danube (c. 53). The Hypanis also (Bog) is *ποταμὸς ἐν ὀλίγοισι μέγας* (c. 52).

But he appears to forget the existence of these rivers when he is describing the Persian march.

grouping in the same picture, according to that large sweep of the imagination which is admissible in epical treatment, the Scythians with all their barbarous neighbours from the Carpathian mountains to the river Wolga. The Agathyrsi, the Neuri, the Androphagi, the Melanchlæni, the Budini, the Gelôni, the Sarmatians, and the Tauri—all of them bordering on that vast quadrangular area of 4000 stadia for each side, called Scythia, as Herodotus conceives it[1]—are brought into deliberation and action in consequence of the Persian approach. And Herodotus takes that opportunity of communicating valuable particulars respecting the habits and manners of each. The kings of these nations discuss whether Darius is justified in his invasion, and whether it be prudent in them to aid the Scythians. The latter question is decided in the affirmative by the Sarmatians, the Budini, and the Gelôni, all eastward of the Tanais[2]—in the negative by the rest. The Scythians, removing their waggons with their wives and children out of the way northward, retreat and draw Darius after them from the Danube all across Scythia and Sarmatia to the north-eastern extremity of the territory of the Budini,[3] several days' journey eastward of the Tanais. Moreover they destroy the wells and ruin the herbage as much as they can, so that during all this long march (says Herodotus) the Persians "found nothing to damage, inasmuch as the country was barren". We can hardly understand therefore what they found to live upon. It is in the territory of the Budini, at this easternmost terminus on the borders of the desert, that the Persians perform the only positive acts which are ascribed to them throughout the whole expedition. They burn the wooden wall before occupied, but now deserted, by the Gelôni; and they build, or begin to build, eight large fortresses near the river Oarus. For what purposes these fortresses could have been intended Herodotus gives no intimation; but he says that the unfinished work was yet to be seen even in his day.[4]

The description of his march is rather to be looked upon as a fancy-picture illustrative of Scythian warfare.

1 Herodot. iv. 101.
2 Herodot. iv. 118, 119.
3 Herodot. iv. 120—122.
4 Herodot. iv. 123. Ὅσον μὲν δὴ χρόνον οἱ Πέρσαι ἦισαν διὰ τῆς Σκυθικῆς καὶ τῆς Σαυρομάτιδος χώρης, οἱ δὲ εἶχον οὐδὲν σίνεσθαι, ἄτε τῆς χώρης ἐούσης χέρσου· ἐπεί τε δὲ ἐς τὴν τῶν Βουδίνων χώρην ἐσέβαλον, &c. See Rennell, Geograph. System of Herodotus, p. 114, about the Oarus.

The erections, whatever they were, which were supposed to mark the extreme point of the march of Darius.

Having thus been carried all across Scythia and the other territories above-mentioned in a north-easterly direction, Darius and his army are next marched back a prodigious distance in a north-westerly direction, through the territories of the Melanchlæni, the Androphagi, and the Neuri, all of whom flee affrighted into the northern desert, having been thus compelled against their will to share in the consequences of the war. The Agathyrsi peremptorily require the Scythians to abstain from drawing the Persians into *their* territory on pain of being themselves treated as enemies.[1] Accordingly the Scythians, avoiding the boundaries of the Agathyrsi, direct their retreat in such a manner as to draw the Persians again southward into Scythia. During all this long march backwards and forwards, there are partial skirmishes and combats of horse, but the Scythians steadily refuse any general engagement. And though Darius challenges them formally by means of a herald, with taunts of cowardice, the Scythian king Idanthyrsus not only refuses battle, but explains and defends his policy, and defies the Persians to come and destroy the tombs of their fathers—it will then (he adds) be seen whether the Scythians are cowards or not.[2] The difficulties of Darius have by this time become serious, when Idanthyrsus sends to him the menacing presents of a bird, a mouse, a frog, and five arrows: the Persians are obliged to commence a rapid retreat towards the Danube, leaving, in order to check and slacken the Scythian pursuit, the least effective and the sick part of their army encamped, together with the asses which had been brought with them—animals unknown to the Scythians, and causing great alarm by their braying.[3] However, notwithstanding some delay thus caused, as well as the anxious haste of Darius to reach the Danube, the Scythians, far more rapid in their movements, arrive at the river before him,

Poetical grouping of the Scythians and their neighbours by Herodotus.

may be compared to those evidences of the extreme advance of Dionysus, which the Macedonian army saw on the north of the Jaxartes—"Liberi patris terminos". Quintus Curtius, vii. 9, 15 (vii. 37, 16, Zumpt).

[1] Herodot. iv. 125. Hekatæus ranks the Melanchlæni as a Scythian ἔθνος (Hekat. Fragment. 154, ed. Klausen): he also mentions several other subdivisions of Scythians, who cannot be farther authenticated (Fragm. 155—160).

[2] Herodot. iv. 126, 127.

[3] Herodot. iv. 128—132. The bird, the mouse, the frog, and the arrows are explained to mean: Unless you take to the air like a bird, to the earth like a mouse, or to the water like a frog, you will become the victim of the Scythian arrows.

and open a negotiation with the Ionians left in guard of the bridge, urging them to break it down and leave the Persian king to his fate—inevitable destruction with his whole army.[1]

Here we re-enter the world of reality, at the north bank of the Danube, the place where we before quitted it. All that is reported to have passed in the interval, if tried by the tests of historical matter of fact, can be received as nothing better than a perplexing dream. It only acquires value when we consider it as an illustrative fiction, including, doubtless, some unknown matter of fact, but framed chiefly to exhibit in action those unattackable Nomads who formed the north-eastern barbarous world of a Greek, and with whose manners Herodotus was profoundly struck. "The Scythians[2] (says he), in regard to one of the greatest of human matters, have struck out a plan cleverer than any that I know. In other respects I do not admire them; but they have contrived this great object, that no invader of their country shall ever escape out of it, or shall ever be able to find out and overtake them, unless they themselves choose. For when men have neither walls nor established cities, but are all house-carriers and horse-bowmen—living, not from the plough, but from cattle, and having their dwellings on waggons—how can they be otherwise than unattackable and impracticable to meddle with?" The protracted and unavailing chase ascribed to Darius—who can neither overtake his game nor use his arms, and who hardly even escapes in safety—embodies in detail this formidable attribute of the Scythian Nomads. That Darius actually marched into the country, there can be no doubt. Nothing else is certain, except his ignominious retreat out of it to the Danube; for of the many different guesses,[3] by which

Strong impression produced upon the imagination of Herodotus by the Scythians.

[1] Herodot. iv. 133.

[2] Herodot. iv. 46. Τῷ δὲ Σκυθικῷ γένεϊ ἓν μὲν τὸ μέγιστον τῶν ἀνθρωπηίων πρηγμάτων σοφώτατα πάντων ἐξεύρηται, τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν· τὰ μέντοι ἄλλα οὐκ ἄγαμαι. Τὸ δὲ μέγιστον οὕτω σφι ἀνεύρηται, ὥστε ἀποφυγέειν τε μηδένα ἐπελθόντα ἐπὶ σφέας, μὴ βουλομένους τε ἐξευρεθῆναι, καταλαβεῖν μὴ οἷόν τε εἶναι. Τοῖσι γὰρ μήτε ἄστεα μήτε τείχεα ἢ ἐκτισμένα, ἀλλὰ φερέοικοι ἐόντες πάντες ἕωσι ἱπποτοξόται, ζώοντες μὴ ἀπ' ἀρότου, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ κτηνέων, οἰκήματά τέ σφι ἢ ἐπὶ ζευγέων, κῶς οὐκ ἂν εἴησαν οὗτοι ἄμαχοί τε καὶ ἄποροι προσμίσγειν;

Ἐξεύρηται δέ σφι ταῦτα, τῆς τε γῆς ἐούσης ἐπιτηδέης, καὶ τῶν ποταμῶν ἐόντων σφι συμμάχων, &c.

Compare this with the oration of the Scythian envoys to Alexander the Great, as it stands in Quintus Curtius, vii. 8, 22 (vii. 35, 22, Zumpt).

[3] The statement of Strabo (vii. p. 305), which restricts the march of Darius to the country between the

critics have attempted to cut down the gigantic sketch of Herodotus into a march with definite limits and direction, not one rests upon any positive grounds. We can trace the pervading idea in the mind of the historian, but cannot find out what were his substantive data.

The adventures which took place at the passage of that river, both on the out-march and the home-march, wherein the Ionians are concerned, are far more within the limits of history. Here Herodotus possessed better means of information, and had less of a dominant idea to illustrate. That which passed between Darius and the Ionians on his first crossing is very curious: I have reserved it until the present moment, because it is particularly connected with the incidents which happened on his return.

Order given by Darius to the Ionians at the bridge over the Danube.

On reaching the Danube from Thrace, he found the bridge of boats ready; and when the whole army had passed over, he ordered the Ionians to break it down, as well as to follow him in his land-march into Scythia,[1] the ships being left with nothing but the rowers and seamen essential to navigate them homeward. His order was on the point of being executed, when, fortunately for him, the Mitylenæan general Kôês ventured to call in question the prudence of it, having first asked whether it was the pleasure of the Persian king to listen to advice. Kôês urged that the march on which they were proceeding might prove perilous, and retreat possibly unavoidable; because the Scythians, though

Danube and the Tyras (Dniester), is justly pronounced by Niebuhr (Kleine Schriften, p. 372) to be a mere supposition suggested by the probabilities of the case, because it could not be understood how his large army should cross even the Dniester; it is not to be treated as an affirmation resting upon any authority. "As Herodotus tells us what is impossible (adds Niebuhr), we know nothing at all historically respecting the expedition".

So again the conjecture of Palmerius (Exercitationes ad Auctores Græcos, p. 21) carries on the march somewhat farther than the Dniester—to the Hypanis, or *perhaps* to the Borysthenês. Rennell, Klaproth, and Reichard, are not afraid to extend the march on to the Wolga. Dr. Thirlwall stops within the Tanais, admitting however that no correct historical account can be given of it. Eichwald supposes a long march up the Dniester into Volhynia and Lithuania.

Compare Ukert, Skythien, p. 26; Dahlmann, Historische Forschungen, ii. p. 159–164; Schaffarik, Slavische Alterthümer, i. 10, 3, i. 13, 4—5; and Mr. Kenrick, Remarks on the Life and Writings of Herodotus, prefixed to his Notes on the Second Book of Herodotus, p. xxi. The latter is among those who cannot swim the Dniester: he says —"Probably the Dniester (Tyras) was the real limit of the expedition, and Bessarabia, Moldavia, and the Bukovina, the scene of it".

[1] Herodot. iv. 97. Δαρεῖος ἐκέλευσε τοὺς Ἴωνας τὴν σχεδίην λύσαντας ἕπεσθαι κατ' ἤπειρον ἐωϋτῷ, καὶ τὸν ἐκ τῶν νέων στρατόν.

certain to be defeated if brought to action, might perhaps not suffer themselves to be approached or even discovered. As a precaution against all contingencies, it was prudent to leave the bridge standing and watched by those who had constructed it. Far from being offended at the advice, Darius felt grateful for it, and desired that Kôês would ask him after his return for a suitable reward—which we shall hereafter find granted. He then altered his resolution, took a cord, and tied sixty knots in it. "Take this cord (said he to the Ionians): untie one of the knots in it each day after my advance from the Danube into Scythia. Remain here and guard the bridge until you shall have untied all the knots; but if by that time I shall not have returned, then depart and sail home."[1] With such orders he began his march into the interior. This anecdote is interesting, not only as it discloses the simple expedients for numeration and counting of time then practised, but also as it illustrates the geographical ideas prevalent. Darius did not intend to come back over the Danube, but to march round the Mæôtis, and to return into Persia on the eastern side of the Euxine. No other explanation can be given of his orders. At first, confident of success, he orders the bridge to be destroyed forthwith: he will beat the Scythians, march through their country, and re-enter Media from the eastern side of the Euxine: when he is reminded that possibly he may not be able to find the Scythians, and may be obliged to retreat, he still continues persuaded that this must happen within sixty days, if it happens at all; and that should he remain absent more than sixty days, such delay will be a convincing proof that he will take the other road of return instead of repassing the Danube. The reader who looks at a map of the Euxine and its surrounding territories may be startled at so extravagant a conception; but he should recollect that there was no map of the same or nearly the same accuracy before Herodotus, much less before the contemporaries of Darius. The idea of entering Media by the north from Scythia and Sarmatia over the Caucasus, is familiar to Herodotus in his sketch of the early marches of the Scythians and Cimmerians:

[1] Herodot. iv. 98. ἦν δὲ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ ὑμετέρην αὐτῶν· μέχρι δὲ τούτου, ἐπεί χρόνῳ μὴ παρέω, ἀλλὰ διεξέλθωσι ὑμῖν αἱ τε οὕτω μετέδοξε, φυλάσσετε τὴν σχε- ἡμέραι τῶν ἀμμάτων, ἀποπλέετε ἐς τὴν δίην.

moreover, he tells us that after the expedition of Darius, there came some Scythian envoys to Sparta, proposing an offensive alliance against Persia, and offering on their part to march across the Phasis into Media from the north,[1] while the Spartans were invited to land on the shores of Asia Minor, and advance across the country to meet them from the west. When we recollect that the Macedonians and their leader, Alexander the Great, having arrived at the river Jaxartês, on the north of Sogdiana and on the east of the Sea of Aral, supposed they had reached the Tanais and called the river by that name[2]—we shall not be astonished at the erroneous estimation of distance implied in the plan conceived by Darius.

The Ionians had already remained in guard of the bridge beyond the sixty days commanded, without hearing anything of the Persian army, when they were surprised by the appearance, not of that army, but of a body of Scythians; who acquainted them that Darius was in full retreat and in the greatest distress, and that his safety with the whole army depended upon that bridge. They endeavoured to prevail upon the Ionians, since the sixty days included in their order to remain had now elapsed, to break the bridge and retire; assuring them that if this were done, the destruction of the Persians was inevitable—of course the Ionians themselves would then be free. At first the latter were favourably disposed towards the proposition, which was warmly espoused by the Athenian Miltiadês, despot or governor of the Thracian Chersonese.[3] Had he prevailed, the victor of Marathôn (for such we shall hereafter find him) would have thus inflicted a much more vital blow on Persia than even that celebrated action, and would have brought upon Darius the disastrous fate of his predecessor Cyrus. But the Ionian princes, though leaning at first towards his suggestion, were speedily converted by the representations of Histiæus of Milêtus, who reminded them that the maintenance of his own ascendency over the Milesians, and that of each despot in his respective city, was

The Ionians left in guard of the bridge; their conduct when Darius's return is delayed.

[1] Herodot. vi. 84. Compare his account of the marches of the Cimmerians and of the Scythians into Asia Minor and Media respectively (Herodot. i. 103, 104, iv. 12).

[2] Arrian, Exp. Al. iii. 6, 15; Plutarch, Alexand. c. 45; Quint. Curt. vii. 7, 4, vii. 8, 30 (vii. 29, 5, vii. 36, 7, Zumpt).

[3] Herodot. iv. 138, 136, 137.

assured by means of Persian support alone—the feeling of the population being everywhere against them: consequently, the ruin of Darius would be their ruin also. This argument proved conclusive. It was resolved to stay and maintain the bridge, but to pretend compliance with the Scythians, and prevail upon them to depart, by affecting to destroy it. The northern portion of the bridge was accordingly destroyed, for the length of a bow-shot; while the Scythians departed, under the persuasion that they had succeeded in depriving their enemies of the means of crossing the river.[1] It appears that they missed the track of the retreating host, which was thus enabled, after the severest privation and suffering, to reach the Danube in safety. Arriving during the darkness of the night, Darius was at first terrified to find the bridge no longer joining the northern bank. An Egyptian herald, of stentorian powers of voice, was ordered to call as loudly as possible the name of Histiæus the Milesian. Answer being speedily made, the bridge was re-established, and the Persian army passed over before the Scythians returned to the spot.[2]

The Ionian despots preserve the bridge and enable Darius to recross the river, as a means of support to their own dominion at home.

There can be no doubt that the Ionians here lost an opportunity eminently favourable, such as never again returned, for emancipating themselves from the Persian dominion. Their despots, by whom the determination was made, especially the Milesian Histiæus, were not induced to preserve the bridge by any honourable reluctance to betray the trust reposed in them, but simply by selfish regard to the maintenance of their own unpopular dominion. And we may remark that the real character of this impelling motive, as well as the deliberation accompanying it, may be assumed as resting upon very good evidence, since we are now arrived within the personal knowledge of the Milesian historian Hekatæus, who took an active part in the Ionic revolt a few years afterwards, and who may perhaps have been personally engaged in this expedition. He will be found reviewing with prudence and sobriety the chances of that unfortunate revolt, and distrusting its success from the beginning; while Histiæus of Milêtus will

Opportunity lost of emancipation from the Persians.

1 Herodot. iv. 137—139.

2 Herodot. iv. 140—141.

appear on the same occasion as the fomenter of it, in order to procure his release from an honourable detention at Susa near the person of Darius. The selfishness of this despot, having deprived his countrymen of that real and favourable chance of emancipation which the destruction of the bridge would have opened to them, threw them into revolt a few years afterwards against the entire and unembarrassed force of the Persian king and empire.

Extricated from the perils of the Scythian warfare, Darius marched southward from the Danube through Thrace to the Hellespont, where he crossed from Sestus into Asia. He left however a considerable army in Europe, under the command of Megabazus, to accomplish the conquest of Thrace. Perinthus on the Propontis made a brave resistance,[1] but was at length subdued; after which all the Thracian tribes, and all the Grecian colonies between the Hellespont and the Strymôn, were forced to submit, giving earth and water, and becoming subject to tribute.[2] Near the lower Strymôn was the Edonian town of Myrkinus, which Darius ordered to be made over to Histiæus of Milêtus; for both this Milesian, and Kôês of Mitylênê, had been desired by the Persian king to name their own reward for their fidelity to him on the passage over the Danube.[3] Kôês requested that he might be constituted despot of Mitylênê, which was accomplished by Persian authority; but Histiæus solicited that the territory near Myrkinus might be given to him for the foundation of a colony. As soon as the Persian conquests extended thus far, the site in question was presented to Histiæus, who entered actively upon his new scheme. We shall find the territory near Myrkinus eminent hereafter as the site of Amphipolis; it offered great temptation to settlers, as fertile, well-wooded, convenient for maritime commerce, and near to auriferous and argentiferous mountains.[4]

Conquest of Thrace by the Persians as far as the river Strymôn—Myrkinus near that river given to Histiæus.

It seems however that the Persian dominion in Thrace was disturbed by an invasion of the Scythians, who, in revenge for the aggression of Darius, overran the country as far as the Thracian Chersonese, and are even said to have sent envoys to Sparta, proposing a simultaneous invasion of Persia, from different

[1] Herodot. iv. 143, 144, v. 1, 2.
[2] Herodot. v. 2.
[3] Herodot. v. 11.
[4] Herodot. v. 23.

sides, by Spartans and Scythians. The Athenian Miltiadês, who was despot or governor of the Chersonese, was forced to quit it for some time, and Herodotus ascribes his retirement to the incursion of these Nomads. But we may be permitted to suspect that the historian has misconceived the real cause of such retirement. Miltiadês could not remain in the Chersonese after he had incurred the deadly enmity of Darius by exhorting the Ionians to destroy the bridge over the Danube.[1]

[1] Herodot. vi. 40—84. That Miltiadês could have remained in the Chersonese undisturbed, during the interval between the Scythian expedition of Darius and the Ionic revolt (when the Persians were complete masters of those regions, and when Otanês was punishing other towns in the neighbourhood for evasion of service under Darius), after he had declared so pointedly against the Persians on a matter of life and death to the king and army—appears to me, as it does to Dr. Thirlwall (History of Gr. vol. ii. App. ii. p. 486, ch. xiv. p. 226—249), eminently improbable. So forcibly does Dr. Thirlwall feel the difficulty, that he suspects the reported conduct and exhortations of Miltiadês at the bridge over the Danube to have been a falsehood, fabricated by Miltiadês himself twenty years afterwards, for the purpose of acquiring popularity at Athens during the time immediately preceding the battle of Marathôn.

I cannot think this hypothesis admissible. It directly contradicts Herodotus on a matter of fact very conspicuous, and upon which good means of information seem to have been within his reach. I have already observed that the historian Hekatæus must have possessed personal knowledge of all the relations between the Ionians and Darius, and that he very probably may have been even present at the bridge: all the information given by Hekatæus upon these points would be open to the inquiries of Herodotus. The unbounded gratitude of Darius towards Histiæus shows that some one or more of the Ionic despots present at the bridge must have powerfully enforced the expediency of breaking it down. That the name of the despot who stood forward as chief mover of this resolution should have been forgotten and not mentioned at the time, is highly improbable; yet such must have been the case, if a fabrication by Miltiadês twenty years afterwards could successfully fill up the blank with his own name. The two most prominent matters talked of, after the retreat of Darius, in reference to the bridge, would probably be the name of the leader who urged its destruction, and the name of Histiæus who preserved it; indeed the mere fact of the mischievous influence exercised by the latter afterwards would be pretty sure to keep these points of the case in full view.

There are means of escaping from the difficulty of the case, I think, without contradicting Herodotus on any matter of fact important and conspicuous, or indeed on any matter of fact whatever. We see by vi. 40, that Miltiadês *did quit the Chersonese* between the close of the Scythian expedition of Darius and the Ionic revolt; Herodotus indeed tells us that he quitted it in consequence of an incursion of the Scythians. Now without denying the fact of such an incursion, we may well suppose the historian to have been mistaken in assigning it as the cause of the flight of Miltiadês. The latter was prevented from living in the Chersonese continuously, during the interval between the Persian invasion of Scythia and the Ionic revolt, by fear of Persian enmity: it is not necessary for us to believe that he was never there at all, but his residence there must have been interrupted and insecure. The chronological data in Herodot. vi. 40 are exceedingly obscure and perplexing; but it seems to me that the supposition which I suggest introduces a plausible coherence into the series of historical facts with the slightest possible contradiction to our capital witness.

The only achievement of Miltiades, between the affair on the Danube and his return to Athens shortly before the battle of Marathôn, is the conquest of Lêmnos; and *that* must have taken

The conquests of Megabazus did not stop at the western bank of the Strymôn. He carried his arms across that river, conquering the Pæonians, and reducing the Macedonians under Amyntas to tribute. A considerable number of the Pæonians were transported across into Asia, by express order of Darius, whose fancy had been struck by seeing at Sardis a beautiful Pæonian woman carrying a vessel on her head, leading a horse to water, and spinning flax, all at the same time. This woman had been brought over (we are told) by her two brothers Pigês and Mantyês for the express purpose of arresting the attention of the Great King. They hoped by this means to be constituted despots of their countrymen; and we may presume that their scheme succeeded, for such part of the Pæonians as Megabazus could subdue were conveyed across to Asia and planted in some villages in Phrygia. Such violent transportations of inhabitants were in the genius of the Persian government.[1]

Macedonians and Pæonians conquered by Megabazus.

From the Pæonian lake Prasias, seven eminent Persians were sent as envoys into Macedonia, to whom Amyntas readily gave the required token of submission, inviting them to a splendid banquet. When exhilarated with wine, they demanded to see the women of the regal family, who, being accordingly introduced, were rudely dealt with by the strangers; at length the son of

Insolence and murder of the Persian envoys in Macedonia.

place evidently while the Persians were occupied by the Ionic revolt (between 502—494 B.C.). There is nothing in his recorded deeds inconsistent with the belief, therefore, that between 515—502 B.C. he may not have resided in the Chersonese at all, or at least not for very long together: and the statement of Cornelius Nepos, that he quitted it immediately after the return from Scythia, from fear of the Persians, may be substantially true. Dr. Thirlwall observes (p. 487)—"As little would it appear that when the Scythians invaded the Cheronese, Miltiadês was conscious of having endeavoured to render them an important service. He flies before them, though he had been so secure while the Persian arms were in his neighbourhood." He has here put his finger on what I believe to be the error of Herodotus—the supposition that Miltiadês fled from the Chersonese to avoid the Scythians, whereas he really left it to avoid the Persians.

The story of Strabo (xiii. p. 591), that Darius caused the Greek cities on the Asiatic side of the Hellespont to be burnt down, in order to hinder them from affording means of transport to the Scythians into Asia, seems to me highly improbable. These towns appear in their ordinary condition, Abydus among them, at the time of the Ionic revolt a few years afterwards (Herodot. v. 117).

[1] Herodot. v. 13—16. Nikolaus Damaskênus (Fragm. p. 36, ed. Orell.) tells a similar story about the means by which a Mysian woman attracted the notice of the Lydian king Alyattês. Such repetition of a striking story, in reference to different people and times, has many parallels in ancient history.

Amyntas, Alexander, resented the insult, and exacted for it a signal vengeance. Dismissing the women under pretence that they should return after a bath, he brought back in their place youths in female attire, armed with daggers. Presently the Persians, proceeding to repeat their caresses, were all put to death. Their retinue, and the splendid carriages and equipment which they had brought, disappeared at the same time, without any tidings reaching the Persian army. And when Bubarê, another eminent Persian, was sent into Macedonia to institute researches, Alexander contrived to hush up the proceeding by large bribes, and by giving him his sister Gigæa in marriage.[1]

Histiæus founds a prosperous colony at Myrkinus —Darius sends for him into Asia.

Meanwhile Megabazus crossed over into Asia, carrying with him the Pæonians from the Strymôn. Having become alarmed at the progress of Histiæus with his new city of Myrkinus, he communicated his apprehensions to Darius; who was prevailed upon to send for Histiæus, retaining him about his person, and carrying him to Susa as counsellor and friend, with every mark of honour, but with the secret intention of never letting him revisit Asia Minor. The fears of the Persian general were probably not unreasonable; but this detention of Histiæus at Susa became in the sequel an important event.[2]

Otanês Persian general on the Hellespont—he conquers the Pelasgian population of Lêmnos, Imbros, &c.

On departing for his capital, Darius nominated his brother Artaphernês satrap of Sardis, and Otanês general of the forces on the coast in place of Megabazus. The new general dealt very severely with various towns near the Propontis, on the ground that they had evaded their duty in the late Scythian expedition, and had even harassed the army of Darius in its retreat. He took Byzantium and Chalkêdôn, as well as Antandrus in the Troad, and Lampônium. With the aid of a fleet from Lesbos, he achieved a new conquest—the islands of Lêmnos and Imbros, at that time occupied by a Pelasgic population seemingly without any Greek inhabitants at all. These Pelasgi were of cruel and piratical character, if we may judge by the tenor of the legends respecting them; Lemneian misdeeds being cited as a proverbial expression for atrocities.[3] They were

[1] *Herodot.* v. 20, 21.
[2] Herodot. v. 23, 24.
[3] Herodot. vi. 138. Æschyl. Choêphor. 632; Stephan. Byz. v. Λῆμνος.

distinguished also for ancient worship of Hêphæstus, together with mystic rites in honour of the Kabeiri, and even human sacrifices to their Great Goddess. In their two cities—Hephæstias on the east of the island and Myrina on the west—they held out bravely against Otanês, and did not submit until they had undergone long and severe hardship. Lykarêtus, brother of that Mæandrius whom we have already noticed as despot of Samos, was named governor of Lêmnos; but he soon after died.[1] It is probable that the Pelasgic population of the islands was greatly enfeebled during this struggle, and we even hear that their king Hermon voluntarily emigrated from fear of Darius.[2]

Lêmnos and Imbros thus became Persian possessions, held by a subordinate prince as tributary. A few years afterwards their lot was again changed—they passed into the hands of Athens, the Pelasgic inhabitants were expelled, and fresh Athenian settlers introduced. They were conquered by Miltiadês from the Thracian Chersonese; from Elæus at the south of that peninsula to Lêmnos being within one day's sail with a north wind. The Hephæstieans abandoned their city and evacuated the island with little resistance; but the inhabitants of Myrina stood a siege,[3] and were not expelled without difficulty; both of them found abodes in Thrace, on and near the peninsula of Mount Athos. Both these islands, together with that of Skyros (which was not taken until after the invasion of Xerxês), remained connected with Athens in a manner peculiarly intimate. At the peace of Antalkidas (387 B.C.)—which guaranteed universal autonomy to every Grecian city, great and small—they were specially reserved, and

Lêmnos and Imbros captured by the Athenians and Miltiadês.

The mystic rites in honour of the Kabeiri at Lêmnos and Imbros are particularly noticed by Pherekydês (ap. Strabo, x. p. 472): compare Photius, v. Κάβειροι, and the remarkable description of the periodical Lemnian solemnity in Philostratus (Heroi. p. 740).

The volcanic mountain, Mosychlus, in the north-eastern portion of the island, was still burning in the fourth century B.C. (Antimach. Fragment. xviii. p. 103, Düntzer, Epicc. Græc. Fragm.)

Welcker's Dissertation (Die Æschylische Trilogie, p. 248 *seqq.*) enlarges much upon the Lemnian and Samothracian worship.

[1] Herodot. v. 26, 27. The twenty-seventh chapter is extremely perplexing. As the text reads at present, we ought to make Lykarêtus the subject of certain predications which yet seem properly referable to Otanês. We must consider the words from Οἱ μὲν δὴ Λήμνιοι—down to τελευτῇ—as parenthetical. This is awkward; but it seems the least difficulty in the case, and the commentators are driven to adopt it.

[2] Zenob. Proverb. iii. 85.

[3] Herodot. vi. 140. Charax ap. Stephan. Byz. v. Ἡφαιστία.

considered as united with Athens.[1] The property in their soil was held by men who, without losing their Athenian citizenship, became Lemnian Kleruchs, and as such were classified apart among the military force of the state; while absence in Lêmnos or Imbros seems to have been accepted as an excuse for delay before the courts of justice, so as to escape the penalties of contumacy or departure from the country.[2] It is probable that a considerable number of poor Athenian citizens were provided with lots of land in these islands, though we have no direct information of the fact, and are even obliged to guess the precise time at which Miltiadês made the conquest. Herodotus, according to his usual manner, connects the conquest with an ancient oracle, and represents it as the retribution for ancient legendary crime committed by certain Pelasgi, who, many centuries before, had been expelled by the Athenians from Attica, and had retired to Lêmnos. Full of this legend, he tells us nothing about the proximate causes or circumstances of the conquest, which must probably have been accomplished by the efforts of Athens, jointly with Miltiadês from the Chersonese, during the period that the Persians were occupied in quelling the Ionic revolt, between 502—494 B.C.—since it is hardly to be supposed that Miltiadês would have ventured thus to attack a Persian possession during the time that the satraps had their hands free. The acquisition was probably facilitated by the fact, that the Pelasgic population of the islands had been weakened, as well by their former resistance to the Persian Otanês, as by some years passed under the deputy of a Persian satrap.

In mentioning the conquest of Lêmnos by the Athenians and

[1] Xenophôn, Hellen. v. 1, 31. Compare Plato, Menexenus, c. 17, p. 245, where the words ἡμετέραι ἀποικίαι doubtless mean Lêmnos, Imbros, and Skyros.

[2] Thucyd. iv. 28, v. 8, vii. 57; Phylarchus ap. Athenæum, vi. p. 225; Demosthen. Philippic. 1. c. 12, p. 17, R.: compare the Inscription No. 1686 in the collection of Boeckh, with his remarks, p. 297.

About the stratagems resorted to before the Athenian Dikastery to procure delay by pretended absence in Lêmnos, or Skyros, see Isæus, Or. vi. p. 58 (p. 80 Bek.): Pollux, viii. 7, 81: Hesych. v. Ἰμβριος; Suidas, v. Λημνία δίκη: compare also Carl Rhode, Res Lemnicæ, p. 50 (Wratislaw, 1829).

It seems as if εἰς Δῆμνον πλεῖν had come to be a proverbial expression at Athens for getting out of the way—evading the performance of duty; this seems to be the sense of Demosthenês, Philipp. 1, c. 9, p. 14. ἀλλ' εἰς μὲν Δῆμνον τὸν παρ' ὑμῶν ἱππαρχον δεῖ πλεῖν, τῶν δ' ὑπὲρ τῶν τῆς πόλεως κτημάτων ἀγωνιζομένων Μενέλαον ἱππαρχεῖν.

From the passage of Isæus above alluded to, which Rhode seems to me to construe incorrectly, it appears that there was a legal *connubium* between Athenian citizens and Lemnian women.

Miltiadês, I have anticipated a little on the course of events, because that conquest—though coinciding in point of time with the Ionic revolt (which will be recounted in the following chapter), and indirectly caused by it in so far as it occupied the attention of the Persians—lies entirely apart from the operations of the revolted Ionians. When Miltiadês was driven out of the Chersonese by the Persians, on the suppression of the Ionic revolt, his fame, derived from having subdued Lêmnos,[1] contributed both to neutralise the enmity which he had incurred as governor of the Chersonese, and to procure his election as one of the ten generals for the year of the Marathonian combat.

[1] Herodot. vi. 136.

# CHAPTER XXXV.

## IONIC REVOLT.

HITHERTO the history of the Asiatic Greeks has flowed in a stream distinct from that of the European Greeks. The present chapter will mark the period of confluence between the two.

Darius carries Histiæus to Susa.

At the time when Darius quitted Sardis on his return to Susa, carrying with him the Milesian Histiæus, he left Artaphernês his brother as satrap of Sardis, invested with the supreme command of Western Asia Minor. The Grecian cities on the coast, comprehended under his satrapy, appear to have been chiefly governed by native despots in each; and Milêtus especially, in the absence of Histiæus, was ruled by his son-in-law Aristagoras. That city was now in the height of power and prosperity—in every respect the leading city of Ionia. The return of Darius to Susa may be placed seemingly about 512 B.C., from which time forward the state of things above described continued, without disturbance, for eight or ten years—"a respite from suffering," to use the significant phrase of the historian.[1]

[1] Herodot. v. 27. Μετὰ δὲ οὐ πολλὸν χρόνον, ἄνεως κακῶν ἦν—or ἄνεσις κακῶν—if the conjecture of some critics be adopted. Mr. Clinton, with Larcher and others (see Fasti Hellen. App. 18, p. 314), construe this passage as if the comma were to be placed after μετὰ δὲ, so that the historian would be made to affirm that the period of repose lasted only a short time. It appears to me that the comma ought rather to be placed after χρόνον, and that the "short time" refers to those evils which the historian had been describing before. There must have been an interval of eight years at least, if not of ten years, between the events which the historian had been describing (the evils inflicted by the attacks of Otanês) and the breaking out of the Ionic revolt; which latter event no one places earlier than 504 B.C., though some prefer 502 B.C., others even 500 B.C.

If indeed we admitted with Wesseling (ad Herodot. vi. 40; and Mr. Clinton seems inclined towards the same opinion, see p. 314 *ut sup.*) that the Scythian expedition is to be placed in 508—507 B.C., then indeed the interval between the campaign of Otanês and the Ionic revolt would be contracted into one or two years. But I have already observed that I cannot think

It was about the year 506 B.C. that the exiled Athenian despot Hippias, after having been repelled from Sparta by the unanimous refusal of the Lacedæmonian allies to take part in his cause, presented himself from Sigeium as a petitioner to Artaphernês at Sardis. He now doubtless found the benefit of the alliance which he had formed for his daughter with the despot Æantidês of Lampsakus, whose favour with Darius would stand him in good stead. He made pressing representations to the satrap, with a view of procuring restoration to Athens, on condition of holding it under Persian dominion; and Artaphernês was prepared, if an opportunity offered, to aid him in this design. So thoroughly had he resolved on espousing actively the cause of Hippias, that when the Athenians despatched envoys to Sardis, to set forth the case of the city against its exiled pretender, he returned to them an answer not merely of denial, but of menace—bidding them receive Hippias back again, if they looked for safety.[1] Such a reply was equivalent to a declaration of war, and so it was construed at Athens. It leads us to infer that the satrap was even then revolving in his mind an expedition against Attica, in conjunction with Hippias; but fortunately for the Athenians, other projects and necessities intervened to postpone for several years the execution of the scheme.

Application of the banished Hippias to Artaphernês satrap of Sardis.

Of these new projects, the first was that of conquering the island of Naxos. Here too, as in the case of Hippias, the instigation arose from Naxian exiles—a rich oligarchy which had been expelled by a rising of the people. This island, like all the rest of the Cyclades, was as yet independent of the Persians.[2] It was wealthy, prosperous, possessing a large population both of freemen and slaves, and defended as well by armed ships as by a force of 8000 heavy-armed infantry. The exiles applied for aid to Aristagoras, who saw that he

About 502 B.C.

State of the island of Naxos—Naxian exiles solicit aid from Aristagoras of Milêtus.

508 B.C. a correct date for the Scythian expedition: it seems to me to belong to about 515 B.C. Nor do I know what reason there is for determining the date as Wesseling does, except this very phrase οὐ πολλὸν χρόνον, which is on every supposition exceedingly vague, and which he appears to me not to have construed in the best way.

[1] Herodot. v. 96. Ὁ δὲ Ἀρταφέρνης ἐκέλευέ σφεας εἰ βουλοίατο σόοι εἶναι, καταδέκεσθαι ὀπίσω τὸν Ἱππίην.

[2] Herodot. v. 31. Plutarch says that Lygdamis, established as despot at Naxos by Peisistratus (Herodot. i. 64), was expelled from this post by the

could turn them into instruments of dominion for himself in the island, provided he could induce Artaphernês to embark in the project along with him—his own force not being adequate by itself. Accordingly he went to Sardis, and laid his project before the satrap, intimating that as soon as the exiles should land with a powerful support, Naxos would be reduced with little trouble: that the neighbouring islands of Paros, Andros, Têmos, and the other Cyclades could not long hold out after the conquest of Naxos, nor even the large and valuable island of Eubœa. He himself engaged, if a fleet of 100 ships were granted to him, to accomplish all these conquests for the Great King, and to bear the expenses of the armament besides. Artaphernês entertained the proposition with eagerness, loaded him with praise, and promised him in the ensuing spring 200 ships instead of 100. Messengers despatched to Susa having brought back the ready consent of Darius, a large armament was forthwith equipped under the command of the Persian Megabatês, to be placed at the disposal of Aristagoras—composed both of Persians and of all the tributaries near the coast.[1]

Expedition against Naxos undertaken by Aristagoras with the assistance of Artaphernês the satrap.

With this force Aristagoras and the Naxian exiles set sail from Milêtus, giving out that they were going to the Hellespont: on reaching Chios, they waited in its western harbour of Kaukasa for a fair wind to carry them straight across to Naxos. No suspicion was entertained in that island of its real purpose, nor was any preparation made for resistance; so that the success of Aristagoras would have been complete, had it not been defeated by an untoward incident ending in dispute. Megabatês, with a solicitude which we are surprised to discern in a Persian general, personally made the tour of his fleet, to see that every ship was under proper watch. He discovered a ship from Myndus (an Asiatic Dorian city near Halikarnassus) left without a single man on board. Incensed at such neglect, he called before him Skylax, the commander of the ship, and ordered him to be put in chains, with his head projecting

Lacedæmonians (De Herodot. Malignitat. c. 21, p. 859). I confess that I do not place much confidence in the statements of that treatise as to the many despots expelled by Sparta: we neither know the source from whence Plutarch borrowed them, nor any of the circumstances connected with them.

[1] Herodot. v. 30, 31.

outwards through one of the apertures for oars in the ship's side. Skylax was a guest and friend of Aristagoras, who, on hearing of this punishment, interceded with Megabatês for his release; but finding the request refused, took upon him to release the prisoner himself. He even went so far as to treat the remonstrance of Megabatês with disdain, reminding him that, according to the instructions of Artaphernês, he was only second—himself (Aristagoras) being first. The pride of Megabatês could not endure such treatment: as soon as night arrived, he sent a private intimation to Naxos of the coming of the fleet, warning the islanders to be on their guard. The warning thus fortunately received was turned by the Naxians to the best account. They carried in their property, laid up stores, and made every preparation for a siege, so that when the fleet, probably delayed by the dispute between its leaders, at length arrived, it was met by a stout resistance, remained on the island for four months in prosecution of an unavailing siege, and was obliged to retire without accomplishing anything beyond the erection of a fort, as lodgment for the Naxian exiles. After a large cost incurred, not only by the Persians, but also by Aristagoras himself, the unsuccessful armament was brought back to the coast of Ionia.[1]

Its failure, through dispute between Aristagoras and the Persian general Megabatês.

The failure of this expedition threatened Aristagoras with entire ruin. He had incensed Megabatês, deceived Artaphernês, and incurred an obligation, which he knew not how to discharge, of indemnifying the latter for the costs of the fleet. He began to revolve in his mind the scheme of revolting from Persia, and it so happened that there arrived nearly at the same moment a messenger from his father-in-law Histiæus, who was detained at the court of Susa, secretly instigating him to this very resolution. Not knowing whom to trust with this dangerous message, Histiæus had caused the head of a faithful slave to be shaved — branded upon it the words necessary—and then despatched him, so soon as his hair had grown, to Milêtus, with a verbal intimation to Aristagoras that his head was to be again shaved and examined.[2] Histiæus

Alarm of Aristagoras —he determines to revolt against Persia— instigation to the same effect from Histiæus.

1 Herodot. v. 34, 35.
2 Herodot. v. 35: compare Polyæn. i. 24, and Aulus Gellius, N.A. xvii. 9.

sought to provoke this perilous rising, simply as a means of procuring his own release from Susa, and in the calculation that Darius would send him down to the coast to re-establish order. His message, arriving at so critical a moment, determined the faltering resolution of Aristagoras, who convened his principal partisans at Milêtus, and laid before them the formidable project of revolt. All of them approved it, with one remarkable exception—the historian Hekatæus of Milêtus: who opposed it as altogether ruinous, and contended that the power of Darius was too vast to leave them any prospect of success. When he found direct opposition fruitless, he next insisted upon the necessity of at once seizing the large treasures in the neighbouring temple of Apollo at Branchidæ for the purpose of carrying on the revolt. By this means alone (he said) could the Milesians, too feeble to carry on the contest with their own force alone, hope to become masters at sea—while, if *they* did not take these treasures, the victorious enemy assuredly would. Neither of these recommendations, both of them indicating sagacity and foresight in the proposer, was listened to. Probably the seizure of the treasures — though highly useful for the impending struggle, and though in the end they fell into the hands of the enemy, as Hekatæus anticipated—would have been insupportable to the pious feelings of the people, and would thus have proved more injurious than beneficial:[1] perhaps indeed Hekatæus himself may have urged it with the indirect view of stifling the whole project. We may remark that he seems to have argued the question as if Milêtus were to stand alone in the revolt; not anticipating, as indeed no prudent man could then anticipate, that the Ionic cities generally would follow the example.

Aristagoras and his friends resolved forthwith to revolt. Their first step was to conciliate popular favour throughout Asiatic Greece by putting down the despots in all the various cities — the instruments not less than the supports of Persian ascendency, as Histiæus had well argued at the bridge of the Danube. The opportunity was favourable for striking this blow at once on a considerable scale. For the fleet, recently employed

**Revolt of Aristagoras and the Milesians—the despots in the various cities deposed and seized.**

1 Herodot. v. 36.

at Naxos, had not yet dispersed, but was still assembled at Myus, with many of the despots present at the head of their ships. Accordingly Iatragoras was despatched from Milêtus, at once to seize as many of them as he could, and to stir up the soldiers to revolt. This decisive proceeding was the first manifesto against Darius. Iatragoras was successful: the fleet went along with him, and many of the despots fell into his hands—among them Histiæus (a second person so named) of Termera, Oliatus of Mylasa (both Karians),[1] Kôês of Mitylênê, and Aristagoras (also a second person so named) of Kymê. At the same time the Milesian Aristagoras himself, while he formally proclaimed revolt against Darius, and invited the Milesians to follow him, laid down his own authority, and affected to place the government in the hands of the people. Throughout most of the towns of Asiatic Greece, insular and continental, a similar revolution was brought about; the despots were expelled, and the feelings of the citizens were thus warmly interested in the revolt. Such of these despots as fell into the hands of Aristagoras were surrendered into the hands of their former subjects, by whom they were for the most part quietly dismissed, and we shall find them hereafter active auxiliaries to the Persians. To this treatment the only exception mentioned is Kôês, who was stoned to death by the Mitylenæans.[2]

By these first successful steps the Ionic revolt was made to assume an extensive and formidable character; much more so, probably, than the prudent Hekatæus had anticipated as practicable. The naval force of the Persians in the Ægean was at once taken away from them, and passed to their opponents, who were thus completely masters of the sea; and would in fact have remained so, if a second naval force had not been brought up against them from Phœnicia—a proceeding never before resorted to, and perhaps at that time not looked for.

Extension of the revolt throughout Asiatic Greece—Aristagoras goes to solicit aid from Sparta.

Having exhorted all the revolted towns to name their generals and to put themselves in a state of defence, Aristagoras crossed the Ægean to obtain assistance from Sparta, then under the

[1] Compare Herodotus, v. 121 and vii. 98. Oliatus was son of Ibanôlis, as was also the Mylasian Herakleidês mentioned in v. 121.
[2] Herodot. v. 36, 37, vi. 9.

government of king Kleomenês; to whom he addressed himself, "holding in his hand a brazen tablet, wherein was engraved the circuit of the entire earth, with the whole sea and all the rivers". Probably this was the first map or plan which had ever been seen at Sparta, and so profound was the impression which it made, that it was remembered there even in the time of Herodotus.[1] Having emphatically entreated the Spartans to step forth in aid of their Ionic brethren, now engaged in a desperate struggle for freedom, he proceeded to describe the wealth and abundance (gold, silver, brass, vestments, cattle, and slaves), together with the ineffective weapons and warfare, of the Asiatics. Such enemies as the latter (he said) could be at once put down, and their wealth appropriated, by military training such as that of the Spartans—whose long spear, brazen helmet and breastplate, and ample shield, enabled them to despise the bow, the short javelin, the light wicker target, the turban and trousers, of a Persian.[2] He then traced out on his brazen plan the road from Ephesus to Susa, indicating the intervening nations, all of them affording a booty more or less rich. He concluded by magnifying especially the vast treasures at Susa—"Instead of fighting your neighbours (he concluded), Argeians, Arcadians, and Messenians, from whom you get hard blows and small reward, why do you not make yourself rulers of all Asia,[3] a prize not less easy than lucrative?" Kleomenês replied to these seductive instigations by desiring him to come for an answer on the third day. When

[1] Herodot. v. 49. Τῷ δὴ (Κλεομένεϊ) ἐς λόγους ἦϊε, ὡς Λακεδαιμόνιοι λέγουσι, ἔχων χάλκεον πίνακα, ἐν τῷ γῆς ἁπάσης περίοδος ἐνετέτμητο, καὶ θάλασσά τε πᾶσα καὶ ποταμοὶ πάντες.

The earliest map of which mention is made was prepared by Anaximander in Ionia, apparently not long before this period: see Strabo, i. p. 7; Agathemerus, 1, c. 1; Diogen. Laërt. ii. 1.

Grosskurd, in his note on the above passage of Strabo, as well as Larcher and other critics, appear to think that though this tablet or chart of Anaximander was the earliest which embraced the whole known earth, there were among the Greeks others still earlier, which described particular countries. There is no proof of this, nor can I think it probable: the passage of Apollonius Rhodius (iv. 279) with the Scholia to it, which is cited as evidence, appears to me unworthy of attention.

Among the Roman Agrimensores, it was the ancient practice to engrave their plans, of land surveyed, upon tablets of brass, which were deposited in the public archives, and of which copies were made for private use, though the original was referred to in case of legal dispute (Siculus Flaccus ap. Rei Agrariæ Scriptores, p. 16, ed. Goes: compare Giraud, Recherches sur le Droit de Propriété, p. 116, Aix, 1838).

[2] Herodot. v. 49. δεικνὺς δὲ ἔλεγε ταῦτα ἐς τῆς γῆς τὴν περίοδον, τὴν ἐφέρετο ἐν τῷ πίνακι ἐντετμημένην.

[3] Herodot. v. 49. παρέχον δὲ τῆς Ἀσίης πάσης ἄρχειν εὐπετέως, ἄλλο τι αἱρήσεσθε;

that day arrived, he put to him the simple question, how far it was from Susa to the sea? To which Aristagoras answered with more frankness than dexterity, that it was a three months' journey; and he was proceeding to enlarge upon the facilities of the road when Kleomenês interrupted him—"Quit Sparta before sunset, Milesian stranger: you are no friend to the Lacedæmonians, if you want to carry them a three months' journey from the sea". In spite of this peremptory mandate, Aristagoras tried a last resource. Taking in his hand the bow of supplication, he again went to the house of Kleomenês, who was sitting with his daughter Gorgô, a girl of eight years old. He requested Kleomenês to send away the child, but this was refused, and he was desired to proceed; upon which he began to offer to the Spartan king a bribe for compliance, bidding continually higher and higher from ten talents up to fifty. At length the little girl suddenly exclaimed, "Father, the stranger will corrupt you, if you do not at once go away". The exclamation so struck Kleomenês, that he broke up the interview, and Aristagoras forthwith quitted Sparta.[1]

Refusal of the Spartans to assist him.

Doubtless Herodotus heard the account of this interview from Lacedæmonian informants. Yet we may be permitted to doubt whether any such suggestions were really made, or any such hopes held out, as those which he places in the mouth of Aristagoras—suggestions and hopes which might well be conceived in 450—440 B.C., after a generation of victories over the Persians, but which have no pertinence in the year 502 B.C. Down even to the battle of Marathôn, the name of the Medes was a terror to the Greeks, and the Athenians are highly and justly extolled as the first who dared to look them in the face.[2] To talk about an easy march up to the treasures of Susa and the empire of all Asia, at the time of the Ionic revolt, would have been considered as a proof of insanity. Aristagoras may very probably have represented that the Spartans were more than a match for

[1] Herodot. v. 49, 50, 51. Compare Plutarch, Apophthegm. Laconic. p. 240.

We may remark, both in this instance and throughout all the life and time of Kleomenês, that the Spartan king has the active management and direction of foreign affairs—subject, however, to trial and punishment by the ephors in case of misbehaviour (Herodot. vi. 82). We shall hereafter find the ephors gradually taking into their own hand more and more, the actual management.

[2] Herodot. vi. 112. πρῶτοί δὲ ἀνέσχοντο ἐσθῆτά τε Μηδικὴν ὁρέωντες, καὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας ταύτην ἐσθημένους· τέως δὲ ἦν τοῖσι Ἕλλησι καὶ τὸ οὔνομα τὸ Μήδων φόβος ἀκοῦσαι.

Persians in the field ; but even thus much would have been considered, in 502 B.C., rather as the sanguine hope of a petitioner than as the estimate of a sober looker-on.

Aristagoras applies to Athens—obtains aid both from Athens and Eretria.

The Milesian chief had made application to Sparta, as the presiding power of Hellas—a character which we thus find more and more recognised and passing into the habitual feelings of the Greeks. Fifty years previously to this, the Spartans had been flattered by the circumstance that Crœsus singled them out from all other Greeks to invite as allies : now, they accepted such priority as a matter of course.[1]

Rejected at Sparta, Aristagoras proceeded to Athens, now decidedly the second power in Greece. Here he found an easier task, not only as it was the metropolis (or mother-city) of Asiatic Ionia, but also as it had already incurred the pronounced hostility of the Persian satrap, and might look to be attacked as soon as the project came to suit his convenience, under the instigation of Hippias : whereas the Spartans had not only no kindred with Ionia, beyond that of common Hellenism, but were in no hostile relations with Persia, and would have been provoking a new enemy by meddling in the Asiatic war. The promises and representations of Aristagoras were accordingly received with great favour by the Athenians ; who, over and above the claims of sympathy, had a powerful interest in sustaining the Ionic revolt as an indirect protection to themselves—and to whom the abstraction of the Ionic fleet from the Persians afforded a conspicuous and important relief. The Athenians at once resolved to send a fleet of twenty ships, under Melanthius, as an aid to the revolted Ionians—ships which are designated by Herodotus, "the beginning of the mischiefs between Greeks and barbarians"—as the ships in which Paris crossed the Ægean had before been called in the Iliad of Homer. Herodotus further remarks that

[1] Aristagoras says to the Spartans (v. 49)—*τὰ γὰρ κατήκοντά ἐστι τοιαῦτα· Ἰώνων παῖδας δούλους εἶναι ἀντ' ἐλευθέρων, ὄνειδος καὶ ἄλγος μέγιστον μὲν αὐτοῖσι ἡμῖν, ἔτι δὲ τῶν λοιπῶν ὑμῖν, ὅσῳ προεστέατε τῆς Ἑλλάδος* (Herodot. v. 49). In reference to the earlier incident (Herodot. i. 70)—*Τουτέων τε ὦν εἵνεκεν οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι τὴν συμμαχίην ἐδέξαντο, καὶ ὅτι ἐκ πάντων σφέας προκρίνας Ἑλλήνων, αἱρέετο φίλους* (Crœsus).

An interval of rather more than forty years separates the two events, during which both the feelings of the Spartans, and the feelings of others towards them, had undergone a material change.

it seems easier to deceive many men together than one—since Aristagoras, after having failed with Kleomenês, thus imposed upon the 30,000 citizens of Athens.[1] But on this remark two comments suggest themselves. First, the circumstances of Athens and Sparta were not the same in regard to the Ionic quarrel,—an observation which Herodotus himself had made a little while before: the Athenians had a material interest in the quarrel, political as well as sympathetic, while the Spartans had none. Secondly, the ultimate result of their interference, as it stood in the time of Herodotus, though purchased by severe intermediate hardship, was one eminently gainful and glorifying, not less to Athens than to Greece.[2]

March of Aristagoras up to Sardis with the Athenian and Eretrian allies —burning of the town —retreat and defeat of these Greeks by the Persians.

When Aristagoras returned, he seems to have found the Persians engaged in the siege of Milêtus. The twenty Athenian ships soon crossed the Ægean, and found there five Eretrian ships which had also come to the succour of the Ionians; the Eretrians generously taking this opportunity to repay the assistance formerly rendered to them by the Milesians in their ancient war with Chalkis. On the arrival of these allies, Aristagoras organized an expedition from Ephesus up to Sardis, under the command of his brother Charopinus with others. The ships were left at Korêssus,[3] a mountain and seaport five miles from Ephesus, while the troops marched up under Ephesian guides, first along the river Kayster, next across the mountain range of Tmôlus to Sardis. Artaphernês had not troops enough to do more than hold the strong citadel, so that the assailants possessed themselves of the town without opposition. But he immediately recalled his force near Milêtus,[4] and summoned Persians and Lydians from all the neighbouring districts, thus becoming more

[1] Herodot. v. 97. *πολλοὺς γὰρ οἷκε εἶναι εὐπετέστερον διαβάλλειν ἢ ἕνα, εἰ Κλεομένεα μὲν τὸν Λακεδαιμόνιον μοῦνον οὐκ οἷός τε ἐγένετο διαβάλλειν, τρεῖς δὲ μυριάδας Ἀθηναίων ἐποίησε τοῦτο.*

[2] Herodot. v. 98; Homer, Iliad, v. 62. The criticism of Plutarch (De Malignitat. Herodot. p. 861) on this passage, is rather more pertinent than the criticisms in that ill-tempered composition generally are.

[3] About Korêssus, see Diodôr. xiv. 99, and Xenophôn, Hellen. i. 2, 7.

[4] Charôn of Lampsakus, and Lysanias in his history of Eretria, seem to have mentioned this first siege of Milêtus, and the fact of its being raised in consequence of the expedition to Sardis: see Plutarch, de Herodot. Malignit. p. 861—though the citation is given there confusedly, so that we cannot make much out of it.

than a match for Charopinus, who found himself moreover obliged to evacuate Sardis owing to an accidental conflagration. Most of the houses in that city were built in great part with reeds or straw, and all of them had thatched roofs. Hence it happened that a spark touching one of them set the whole city in flame. Obliged to abandon their dwellings by this accident, the population of the town congregated in the market-place,—and as reinforcements were hourly crowding in, the position of the Ionians and Athenians became precarious. They evacuated the town, took up a position on Mount Tmôlus, and when night came, made the best of their way to the sea-coast. The troops of Artaphernês pursued, overtook them near Ephesus, and defeated them completely. Eualkidês the Eretrian general, a man of eminence and a celebrated victor at the solemn games, perished in the action, together with a considerable number of troops. After this unsuccessful commencement, the Athenians betook themselves to their vessels and sailed home, in spite of pressing instances on the part of Aristagoras to induce them to stay. They took no farther part in the struggle;[1] a retirement at once so sudden and so complete, that they must probably have experienced some glaring desertion on the part of their Asiatic allies, similar to that which brought so much danger upon the Spartan general Derkyllidas, in 396 B.C. Unless such was the case, they seem open to censure rather for having too soon withdrawn their aid, than for having originally lent it.[2]

The Athenians abandon the alliance.

The burning of a place so important as Sardis, however, including the temples of the local goddess Kybêbê, which perished with the remaining buildings, produced a powerful effect on both sides—encouraging the revolters, as well as incensing the Persians. Aristagoras despatched ships along the coast, northward as far as Byzantium, and southward as far as Cyprus. The Greek cities near the Hellespont and the Propontis were induced, either by force or by inclination, to take part with him; the Karians embraced his cause warmly; even the Kaunians who

Extension of the revolt to Cyprus and Byzantium.

[1] Herodot. v. 102, 103. It is a curious fact that Charôn of Lampsakus made no mention of this defeat of the united Athenian and Ionian force: see Plutarch, de Herodot. Malign. *ut sup.*

[2] About Derkyllidas, see Xenophôn, Hellen. iii. 2, 17—19.

had not declared themselves before, joined him as soon as they heard of the capture of Sardis; while the Greeks in Cyprus, with the single exception of the town of Amathûs, at once renounced the authority of Darius, and prepared for a strenuous contest. Onesilus of Salamis, the most considerable city in the island, finding the population willing, but his brother, the despot Gorgus, reluctant, shut the latter out of the gates, took the command of the united forces of Salamis and the other revolting cities, and laid siege to Amathûs. These towns of Cyprus were then, and seem always afterwards to have continued, under the government of despots; who however, unlike the despots in Ionia generally, took part along with their subjects in the revolt against Persia.[1]

The rebellion had now assumed a character so serious, that the Persians were compelled to put forth their strongest efforts to subdue it. From the number of different nations comprised in their empire, they were enabled to make use of the antipathies of one against the other; and the old adverse feeling of Phœnicians against Greeks was now found extremely serviceable. After a year spent in getting together forces,[2] the Phœnician fleet was employed to transport into Cyprus the Persian general Artybius with a Kilikian and Egyptian army;[3] while the force under Artaphernês at Sardis was so strengthened as to enable him to act at once against all the coast of Asia Minor, from the Propontis to the Triopian promontory. On the other side, the common danger had for the moment brought the Ionians into a state of union foreign to their usual habit; so that we hear now, for the first and the last time, of a tolerably efficient Pan-Ionic authority.[4]

Phœnician fleet called forth by the Persians.

Apprised of the coming of Artybius with the Phœnician fleet, Onesilus and his Cyprian supporters solicited the aid of the Ionic fleet, which arrived shortly after the disembarkation of the Persian force in the island. Onesilus offered to the Ionians

[1] Herodot. v. 103, 104, 108. Compare the proceedings in Cyprus against Artaxerxês Mnêmôn, under the energetic Evagoras of Salamis (Diodôr. xiv. 98, xv. 2), about 386 B.C.; most of the petty princes of the island became for the time his subjects, but in 351 B.C. there were nine of them independent (Diodôr. xvi. 42), and seemingly quite as many at the time when Alexander besieged Tyre (Arrian, ii. 20, 8).

[2] Herodot. v. 116. Κύπριοι μὲν δὴ, ἐνιαυτὸν ἐλεύθεροι γενόμενοι, αὖτις ἐκ νέης κατεδεδούλωντο.

[3] Herodot. vi. 6. Κίλικές τε καὶ Αἰγύπτιοι.

[4] Herodot. v. 109. Ἡμέας ἀπέπεμψε τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Ἰώνων φυλάξοντας τὴν θάλασσαν, &c.; compare vi. 7.

their choice, whether they would fight the Phœnicians at sea or the Persians on land. Their natural determination was in favour of the sea-fight, and they engaged with a degree of courage and unanimity which procured for them a brilliant victory; the Samians being especially distinguished.[1] But the combat on land, carried on at the same time, took a different turn. Onesilus and the Salaminians brought into the field, after the fashion of Orientals rather than of Greeks, a number of scythed chariots, destined to break the enemy's ranks; while on the other hand the Persian general Artybius was mounted on a horse, trained to rise on his hind-legs and strike out with his fore-legs against an opponent on foot. In the thick of the fight, Onesilus and his Karian shield-bearer came into personal conflict with this general and his horse. By previous concert, when the horse so reared as to get his fore-legs over the shield of Onesilus, the Karian with a scythe severed the legs from his body, while Onesilus with his own hand slew Artybius. But the personal bravery of the Cypriots was rendered useless by treachery in their own ranks. Stêsênôr, despot of Kurium, deserted in the midst of the battle, and even the scythed chariots of Salamis followed his example; while the brave Onesilus, thus weakened, perished in the total rout of his army, along with Aristokyprus despot of Soli on the north coast of the island: this latter was son of that Philokyprus who had been immortalized more than sixty years before in the poems of Solôn. No farther hopes now remaining for the revolters, the victorious Ionian fleet returned home. Salamis relapsed under the sway of its former despot Gorgus, while the remaining cities in Cyprus were successively besieged and taken; not without a resolute defence, however, since Soli alone held out five months.[2]

**Persian and Phœnician armament sent against Cyprus—the Ionians send aid thither—victory of the Persians—they reconquer the island.**

[1] Herodot. v. 112.

[2] Herodot. v. 112—115. It is not uninteresting to compare, with this reconquest of Cyprus by the Persians, the conquest of the same island by the Turks in 1570, when they expelled from it the Venetians. See the narrative of that conquest (effected in the reign of Selim II. by the Serackier Mustapha-Pasha), in Von Hammer, Geschichte des Osmanischen Reichs, book xxxvi. vol. iii. p. 578—589. Of the two principal towns, Nikosia in the centre of the island, and Famagusta on the north-eastern coast, the first, after a long siege, was taken by storm, and the inhabitants of every sex and age either put to death or carried into slavery; while the second, after a most gallant defence, was allowed to capitulate. But the terms of the capitulation were violated in the most

Meanwhile the principal force of Darius having been assembled at Sardis, Daurisês, Hymeas, and other generals who had married daughters of the Great King, distributed their efforts against different parts of the western coast. Daurisês attacked the towns near the Hellespont[1]—Abydus, Perkôtê, Lampsakus, and Pæsus—which made little resistance. He was then ordered southward into Karia, while Hymeas, who with another division had taken Kios on the Propontis, marched down to the Hellespont and completed the conquest of the Troad as well as of the Æolic Greeks in the region of Ida. Artaphernês and Otanês attacked the Ionic and Æolic towns on the coast—the former taking Klazomenæ,[2] the latter Kymê.

Successes of the Persian against the revolted coast of Asia Minor.

There remained Karia, which, with Milêtus in its neighbourhood, offered a determined resistance to Daurisês. Forewarned of his approach, the Karians assembled at a spot called the White Pillars, near the confluence of the rivers Mæander and Marsyas. Pixodarus, one of their chiefs, recommended the desperate expedient of fighting with the river at their back, so that all chance of flight might be cut off; but most of the chiefs decided in favour of a contrary policy[3]—to let the Persians pass

flagitious manner by the Seraskier, who treated the brave Venetian governor, Bragadino, with frightful cruelty, cutting off his nose and ears, exposing him to all sorts of insults, and ultimately causing him to be flayed alive. The skin of this unfortunate general was conveyed to Constantinople as a trophy, but in after times found its way to Venice.

We read of nothing like this treatment of Bragadino in the Persian reconquest of Cyprus, though it was a subjugation after revolt; indeed nothing like it in all Persian warfare.

Von Hammer gives a short sketch (not always very accurate as to ancient times) of the condition of Cyprus under its successive masters—Persians, Græco-Egyptians, Romans, Arabians, the dynasty of Lusignan, Venetians, and Turks: the last seems decidedly the worst of all.

In reference to the above-mentioned piece of cruelty, I may mention that the Persian king Kambysês caused one of the royal judges (according to Herodotus, v. 25), who had taken a bribe to render an iniquitous judgment, to be flayed alive, and his skin to be stretched upon the seat on which his son was placed to succeed him, as a lesson of justice to the latter. A similar story is told respecting the Persian king Artaxerxês Mnêmôn; and what is still more remarkable, the same story is also recounted in the Turkish history, as an act of Mahomet II. (Von Hammer, Geschichte des Osmanisch. Reichs, book xvii., vol. ii. p. 209; Diodôrus, xv. 10). Ammianus Marcellinus (xxiii. 6) had good reason to treat the reality of the fact as problematical.

[1] Herodot. v. 117.

[2] Herodot. v. 122—124.

[3] Herodot. v. 118. On the topography of this spot, as described in Herodotus, see a good note in Weissenborn, Beyträge zur genaueren Erforschung der alt. Griech. Geschichte, p. 116, Jena, 1844.

He thinks, with much reason, that the river Marsyas here mentioned cannot be that which flows through Kelænæ, but another of the same

the river, in hopes of driving them back into it and thus rendering their defeat total. Victory however, after a sharp contest, declared in favour of Daurisês, chiefly in consequence of his superior numbers. Two thousand Persians, and not less than ten thousand Karians, are said to have perished in the battle. The Karian fugitives, re-united after the flight in the grove of noble plane-trees consecrated to Zeus Stratius near Labranda,[1] were deliberating whether they should now submit to the Persians or emigrate for ever, when the appearance of a Milesian reinforcement restored their courage. A second battle was fought, and a second time they were defeated, the loss on this occasion falling chiefly on the Milesians.[2] The victorious Persians now proceeded to assault the Karian cities, but Herakleidês of Mylasa laid an ambuscade for them with so much skill and good fortune, that their army was nearly destroyed, and Daurisês with other Persian generals perished. This successful effort, following upon two severe defeats, does honour to the constancy of the Karians, upon whom Greek proverbs generally fasten a mean reputation. It saved for the time the Karian towns, which the Persians did not succeed in reducing until after the capture of Milêtus.[3]

Aristagoras loses courage and abandons the country.

On land, the revolters were thus everywhere worsted, though at sea the Ionians still remained masters. But the unwarlike Aristagoras began to despair of success, and to meditate a mean desertion of the companions and countrymen whom he had himself betrayed into danger. Assembling his chief advisers, he represented to them the unpromising state of affairs, and the necessity of securing some place of refuge, in case they were expelled from Milêtus. He then put the question to them, whether the island of Sardinia, or Myrkinus in Thrace near the Strymôn (which Histiæus had begun some time before to fortify, as I have mentioned in the

name which flows into the Mæander from the south-west.

[1] About the village of Labranda and the temple of Zeus Stratius, see Strabo, xiv. p. 659. Labranda was a village in the territory of, and seven miles distant from, the inland town of Mylasa. It was Karian at the time of the Ionic revolt, but partially hellenized before the year 350 B.C. About this latter epoch, the three rural tribes of Mylasa —constituting, along with the citizens of the town, the Mylasene community— were, Ταρκόνδαρα, Ὀτώρκονδα, Λάβρανδα —see the Inscription in Boeckh's Collection, No. 2695, and in Franz, Epigraphicê Græca, No. 73, p. 191. In the Lydian language, λάβρυς is said to have signified a hatchet (Plutarch, Quæst. Gr. c. 45, p. 314).

[2] Herodot. v. 118, 119.

[3] Herodot. v. 120, 121; vi. 25.

preceding chapter), appear to them best adapted to the purpose. Among the persons consulted was Hekatæus the historian, who approved neither the one nor the other scheme, but suggested the erection of a fortified post in the neighbouring island of Leros ; a Milesian colony, wherein a temporary retirement might be sought, should it prove impossible to hold Milêtus, but which permitted an easy return to that city, so soon as opportunity offered.[1] Such an opinion must doubtless have been founded on the assumption, that they would be able to maintain superiority at sea. It is important to note such confident reliance upon this superiority in the mind of a sagacious man, not given to sanguine hopes, like Hekatæus—even under circumstances very unprosperous on land. Emigration to Myrkinus, as proposed by Aristagoras, presented no hope of refuge at all ; since the Persians, if they regained their authority in Asia Minor, would not fail again to extend it to the Strymôn. Nevertheless the consultation ended by adopting this scheme, since probably no Ionians could endure the immeasurable distance of Sardinia as a new home. Aristagoras set sail for Myrkinus, taking with him all who chose to bear him company. But he perished not long after landing, together with nearly all his company, in the siege of a neighbouring Thracian town.[2] Though making profession to lay down his supreme authority at the commencement of the revolt, he had still contrived to retain it in great measure ; and on departing for Myrkinus, he devolved it on Pythagoras, a citizen in high esteem. It appears however that the Milesians, glad to get rid of a leader who had brought them nothing but mischief,[3] paid little obedience to his successor, and made their government from this period popular in reality as well as in profession. The desertion of Aristagoras, with the citizens whom he carried away, must have seriously damped the spirits of those who remained. Nevertheless it seems that the cause of the Ionic revolters was quite as well conducted without him.

Not long after his departure, another despot—Histiæus of Milêtus, his father-in-law, and jointly with him the fomenter of

[1] Herodot. v. 125 ; Strabo, xiv. p. 635.

ἄσμενοι ἀπαλλαχθέντες καὶ Ἀρισταγόρεω, οὐδαμῶς προθύμοι ἦσαν ἄλλον τύραννον δέκεσθαι ἐς τὴν χώρην, οἷά τε ἐλευθερίης γευσάμενοι.

[2] Herodot. v. 126.

[3] Herodot. vi. 5. Οἱ δὲ Μιλήσιοι,

the revolt—presented himself at the gates of Milêtus for admission. The outbreak of the revolt had enabled him, as he had calculated, to procure leave of departure from Darius. That prince had been thrown into violent indignation by the attack and burning of Sardis, and by the general revolt of Ionia, headed (so the news reached him) by the Milesian Aristagoras, but carried into effect by the active co-operation of the Athenians. "The Athenians (exclaimed Darius)—who are *they?*" On receiving the answer, he asked for his bow, placed an arrow on the string, and shot as high as he could towards the heavens, saying—"Grant me, Zeus, to revenge myself on the Athenians". He at the same time desired an attendant to remind him thrice every day at dinner—"Master, remember the Athenians": for, as to the Ionians, he felt assured that their hour of retribution would come speedily and easily enough.[1]

Appearance of Histiæus, who had obtained leave of departure from Susa.

This Homeric incident deserves notice as illustrating the epical handling of Herodotus. His theme is, the invasions of Greece by Persia: he has now arrived at the first eruption, in the bosom of Darius, of that passion which impelled the Persian forces towards Marathôn and Salamis—and he marks the beginning of the new phase by act and word both alike significant. It may be compared to the libation and prayer addressed by Achilles in the Iliad to Zeus, at the moment when he is sending forth Patroklus and the Myrmidons to the rescue of the despairing Greeks.

At first Darius had been inclined to ascribe the movement in Ionia to the secret instigation of Histiæus, whom he called into his presence and questioned. But the latter found means to satisfy him, and even to make out that no such mischief would have occurred, if he (Histiæus) had been at Milêtus instead of being detained at Susa. "Send me down to the spot (he asseverated), and I engage not merely to quell the revolt and put into your hands the traitor who heads it, but also not to take off this tunic from my body before I shall have added to your empire the great island of Sardinia." An expedition to Sardinia,

[1] Herodot. v. 105. Ὦ Ζεῦ, ἐκγενέσθαι μοι Ἀθηναίους τίσασθαι. Compare the Thracian practice of communicating with the gods by shooting arrows high up into the air (Herodot. iv. 94).

though never realised, appears to have been among the favourite fancies of the Ionic Greeks of that day.[1] By such boasts and assurances he obtained his liberty, and went down to Sardis, promising to return as soon as he should have accomplished them.[2] But on reaching Sardis he found the satrap Artaphernês better informed than the Great King at Susa. Though Histiæus, when questioned as to the causes which had brought on the outbreak, affected nothing but ignorance and astonishment, Artaphernês detected his evasions, and said—"I will tell you how the facts stand, Histiæus: it is you that have stitched this shoe, and Aristagoras has put it on".[3] Such a declaration promised little security to the suspected Milesian who heard it: and accordingly, as soon as night arrived, he took to flight, went down to the coast, and from thence passed over to Chios. Here he found himself seized on the opposite count, as the confidant of Darius and the enemy of Ionia. He was released, however, on proclaiming himself not merely a fugitive escaping from Persian custody, but also as the prime author of the Ionic revolt: and he farther added, in order to increase his popularity, that Darius had contemplated the translation of the Ionian population to Phœnicia, as well as that of the Phœnician population to Ionia—to prevent which translation he (Histiæus) had instigated the revolt. This allegation, though nothing better than a pure fabrication, obtained for him the goodwill of the Chians, who carried him back to Milêtus: but before he departed, he despatched to Sardis some letters, addressed to distinguished Persians, framed as if he were already in established intrigue with them for revolting against Darius, and intended to invite them to actual revolt. His messenger, Hermippus of Atarneus, betrayed him, and carried his letters straight to Artaphernês. The satrap desired that these letters might be delivered to the

Histiæus suspected by Artaphernês—flees to Chios.

[1] Herodot. v. 107, vi. 2. Compare the advice of Bias of Priênê to the Ionians, when the Persian conqueror Cyrus was approaching, to found a Pan-Ionic colony in Sardinia (Herodot. i. 170): the idea started by Aristagoras has been alluded to just above (Herodot. v. 124).

Pausanias (iv. 23, 2) puts into the mouth of Mantiklus, son of Aristomenês, a recommendation to the Messenians, when conquered a second time by the Spartans, to migrate to Sardinia.

[2] Herodot. v. 106, 107.

[3] Herodot. vi. 1. *Οὕτω τοι, Ἰστίαιε, ἔχει κατὰ ταῦτα τὰ πρήγματα· τοῦτο τὸ ὑπόδημα ἐρράψας μὲν σὺ, ὑπεδήσατο δὲ Ἀρισταγόρης.*

persons to whom they were addressed, but that the answers sent to Histiæus might be handed to himself. Such was the tenor of the answers, that Artaphernês was induced to seize and put to death several of the Persians around him: but Histiæus was disappointed in his purpose of bringing about a revolt in the place.[1]

On arriving at Milêtus, Histiæus found Aristagoras no longer present, and the citizens altogether adverse to the return of their old despot: nevertheless he tried to force his way by night into the town, but was repulsed and even wounded in the thigh. He returned to Chios, but the Chians refused him the aid of any of their ships: he next passed to Lesbos, from the inhabitants of which island he obtained eight triremes, and employed them to occupy Byzantium, pillaging and detaining the Ionian merchant-ships as they passed into or out of the Euxine.[2] The few remaining piracies of this worthless traitor, mischievous to his countrymen even down to the day of his death, hardly deserve our notice amidst the last struggles and sufferings of the subjugated Ionians, to which we are now hastening.

He attempts in vain to procure admission into Milêtus —puts himself at the head of a small piratical squadron.

A vast Persian force, both military and naval, was gradually concentrating itself near Milêtus, against which city Artaphernês had determined to direct his principal efforts. Not only the whole army of Asia Minor, but also the Kilikian and Egyptian troops fresh from the conquest of Cyprus, and even the conquered Cypriots themselves, were brought up as reinforcements; while the entire Phœnician fleet, no less than 600 ships strong, co-operated on the coast.[3] To meet such a land-force in the field was far beyond the strength of the Ionians, and the joint Pan-Ionic council resolved that the Milesians should be left to defend their own fortifications, while the entire force of the confederate cities should be mustered on board the ships. At sea they had as yet no reason to despair, having been victorious over the Phœnicians near Cyprus, and having sustained no defeat. The combined Ionic fleet, including the Æolic Lesbians,

Large Persian force assembled, aided by the Phœnician fleet, for the siege of Milêtus.

[1] Herodot. vi. 2—5. [2] Herodot. vi. 5—26. [3] Herodot. vi. 6—9.

amounting in all to the number of 353 ships, was accordingly mustered at Ladê—then a little island near Milêtus, but now joined on to the coast, by the gradual accumulation of land in the bay at the mouth of the Mæander. Eighty Milesian ships formed the right wing, one hundred Chian ships the centre, and sixty Samian ships the left wing, while the space between the Milesians and the Chians was occupied by twelve ships from Priênê, three from Myus, and seventeen from Teôs—the space between the Chians and Samians was filled by eight ships from Erythræ, three from Phôkæa, and seventy from Lesbos.[1]

The allied Grecian fleet mustered at Ladê.

The total armament thus made up was hardly inferior in number to that which, fifteen years afterwards, gained the battle of Salamis against a far larger Persian fleet than the present. Moreover, the courage of the Ionians, on ship-board, was equal to that of their contemporaries on the other side of the Ægean; while in respect of disagreement among the allies, we shall hereafter find the circumstances preceding the battle of Salamis still more menacing than those before the coming battle of Ladê. The chances of success therefore were at least equal between the two, and indeed the anticipations of the Persians and Phœnicians on the present occasion were full of doubt, so that they thought it necessary to set on foot express means for disuniting the Ionians—it was fortunate for the Greeks that Xerxês at Salamis could not be made to conceive the prudence of aiming at the same object. There were now in the Persian camp all those various despots whom Aristagoras, at the beginning of the revolt, had driven out of their respective cities. At the instigation of Artaphernês, each of these men despatched secret communications to their citizens in the allied fleet, endeavouring to detach them severally from the general body, by promises of gentle treatment in the event of compliance, and by threats of extreme infliction from the Persians if they persisted in armed efforts. Though these communications were sent to each without the knowledge of the rest, yet the answer from all was one unanimous negative.[2] The confederates at Ladê seemed more one, in heart and spirit,

Attempts of the Persians to disunite the allies, by means of the exiled despots.

[1] Herodot. vi. 8.

[2] Herodot. vi. 9, 10.

than the Athenians, Spartans, and Corinthians will hereafter prove to be at Salamis.

But there was one grand difference which turned the scale—the superior energy and ability of the Athenian leaders at Salamis, coupled with the fact that they *were* Athenians—that is, in command of the largest and most important contingent throughout the fleet.

**Want of command and discipline in the Grecian fleet.**

At Ladê, unfortunately, this was quite otherwise. Each separate contingent had its own commander, but we hear of no joint commander at all. Nor were the chiefs who came from the larger cities—Milesian, Chian, Samian, or Lesbian—men like Themistoklês, competent and willing to stand forward as self-created leaders, and usurp for the moment, with the general consent and for the general benefit, a privilege not intended for them. The only man of sufficient energy and forwardness to do this was the Phokæan Dionysius—unfortunately the captain of the smallest contingent of the fleet, and therefore enjoying the least respect. For Phôkæa, once the daring explorer of the western waters, had so dwindled down since the Persian conquest of Ionia, that she could now furnish no more than three ships, and her ancient maritime spirit survived only in the bosom of her captain. When Dionysius saw the Ionians assembled at Ladê, willing, eager, full of talk and mutual encouragement, but untrained and taking no thought of discipline, or nautical practice, or co-operation in the hour of battle—he saw the risk which they ran for want of these precautions, and strenuously remonstrated with them: "Our fate hangs on the razor's edge, men of Ionia: either to be freemen or slaves,—and slaves, too, caught after running away. Set yourselves at once to work and duty. You will then have trouble indeed at first, with certain victory and freedom afterwards; but if you persist in this carelessness and disorder, there is no hope for you to escape the king's revenge for your revolt. Be persuaded and commit yourself to me. I pledge myself, if the gods only hold an equal balance, that your enemies either will not fight, or will be severely beaten."[1]

**Energy of the Phokæan Dionysius—he is allowed to assume the command.**

[1] Herodot. vi. 11. Ἐπὶ ξυροῦ γὰρ Ἴωνες, ἢ εἶναι ἐλευθέροισι, ἢ δούλοισι, ἀκμῆς ἔχεται ἡμῖν τὰ πρήγματα, ἄνδρες καὶ τούτοισι ὡς δρηπέτῃσι· νῦν ὦν ὑμέες,

The wisdom of this advice was so apparent, that the Ionians, quitting their comfortable tents on the shore of Ladê, and going on board their ships, submitted themselves to the continuous nautical labours and manœuvres imposed upon them by Dionysius. The rowers and the hoplites on the deck were exercised in their separate functions, and even when they were not so employed, the ships were kept at anchor, and the crews on board, instead of on shore; so that the work lasted all day long, under a hot summer's sun. Such labour was new to the Ionian crews. They endured it for seven successive days, after which they broke out with one accord into resolute mutiny and refusal: "Which of the gods have we offended, to bring upon ourselves such a retribution as this? madmen as we are, to put ourselves into the hands of this Phôkæan braggart, who has furnished only three ships![1] He has now got us and is ruining us without remedy; many of us are already sick, many others are sickening. We had better make up our minds to Persian slavery, or any other mischiefs, rather than go on with these present sufferings. Come, we will not obey this man any longer." And they forthwith refused to execute his orders, resuming their tents on shore, with the enjoyments of shade, rest, and inactive talk, as before.

Discontent of the Grecian crews—they refuse to act under Dionysius.

I have not chosen to divest this instructive scene of the dramatic liveliness with which it is given in Herodotus—the more so as it has all the air of reality, and as Hekatæus the historian was probably present in the island of Ladê, and may have described what he actually saw and heard. When we see the intolerable hardship which these nautical manœuvres and labours imposed upon the Ionians, though men not unaccustomed to ordinary ship-work, — and when we witness their perfect incapacity to submit themselves to such a discipline, even with extreme danger staring them in the face—we shall be able to appreciate the severe and unremitting toil whereby the Athenian

ἦν μὲν βούλησθε ταλαιπωρίας ἐνδέκεσθαι, τὸ παραχρῆμα μὲν πόνος ὑμῖν ἔσται, οἷοί τε δὲ ἔσεσθε, ὑπερβαλλόμενοι τοὺς ἐναντίους, εἶναι ἐλεύθεροι, &c.

[1] Herodot. vi. 12. Οἱ Ἴωνες, οἷα ἀπαθέες ἐόντες πόνων τοιούτων, τετρυμένοι τε ταλαιπωρίῃσί τε καὶ ἡελίῳ, ἔλεξαν πρὸς ἑωϋτοὺς τάδε—Τίνα δαιμόνων παραβάντες, τάδε ἀναπίμπλαμεν, οἵτινες παραφρονήσαντες, καὶ ἐκπλώσαντες ἐκ τοῦ νόου, ἀνδρὶ Φωκαεῖ ἀλαζόνι, παρεχομένῳ νέας τρεῖς, ἐπιτρέψαντες ἡμέας αὐτοὺς ἔχομεν; &c.

seaman afterwards purchased that perfection of nautical discipline which characterised him at the beginning of the Peloponnesian war. It will appear, as we proceed with this history, that the full development of the Athenian democracy worked a revolution in Grecian military marine, chiefly by enforcing upon the citizen seaman a strict continuous training, such as was only surpassed by the Lacedæmonian drill on land, and by thus rendering practicable a species of nautical manœuvring, which was unknown even at the time of the battle of Salamis. I shall show this more fully hereafter: at present I contrast it briefly with the incapacity of the Ionians at Ladê, in order that it may be understood how painful such training really was. The reader of Grecian history is usually taught to associate only ideas of turbulence and anarchy with the Athenian democracy. But the Athenian navy, the child and champion of that democracy, will be found to display an indefatigable labour and obedience nowhere else witnessed in Greece—of which even the first lessons, as in the case now before us, prove to others so irksome as to outweigh the prospect of extreme and imminent peril. The same impatience of steady toil and discipline, which the Ionians displayed to their own ruin before the battle of Ladê, will be found to characterize them fifty years afterwards as allies of Athens, as I shall have occasion to show when I come to describe the Athenian empire.

Contrast of this incapacity of the Ionic crews with the subsequent severe discipline of the Athenian seaman.

Ending in this abrupt and mutinous manner, the judicious suggestions of the Phôkæan leader did more harm than good. Perhaps his manner of dealing may have been unadvisedly rude; but we are surprised to see that no one among the leaders of the larger contingents had the good sense to avail himself of the first readiness of the Ionians, and to employ his superior influence in securing the continuance of a good practice once begun. Not one such superior man did this Ionic revolt throw up. From the day in which the Ionians discarded Dionysius, their camp became a scene of disunion and mistrust. Some of them grew so reckless and unmanageable, that the better portion despaired of maintaining any orderly battle; and the Samians in particular now repented that they had declined the secret offers

Disorder and mistrust grow up in the fleet—treachery of the Samian captains.

made to them by their expelled despot[1]—Æakês son of Sylosôn. They sent privately to renew the negotiation, received a fresh promise of the same indulgence, and agreed to desert when the occasion arrived. On the day of battle, when the two fleets were on the point of coming to action, the sixty Samian ships all sailed off, except eleven whose captains disdained such treachery. Other Ionians followed their example; yet amidst the reciprocal crimination which Herodotus had heard, he finds it difficult to determine who was most to blame, though he names the Lesbians as among the earliest deserters.[2] The hundred ships from Chios, constituting the centre of the fleet—each ship carrying forty chosen soldiers fully armed—formed a brilliant exception to the rest. They fought with the greatest fidelity and resolution, inflicting upon the enemy, and themselves sustaining, heavy loss. Dionysius the Phôkæan also behaved in a manner worthy of his previous language, and captured with his three ships the like number of Phœnicians. But such examples of bravery did not compensate the treachery or cowardice of the rest. The defeat of the Ionians at Ladê was complete as well as irrecoverable. To the faithful Chians, the loss was terrible both in the battle and after it; for though some of their vessels escaped from the defeat safely to Chios, others were so damaged as to be obliged to run ashore close at hand on the promontory of Mykalê, where the crews quitted them, with the intention of marching northward through the Ephesian territory to the continent opposite their own island. We hear with astonishment that at that critical moment the Ephesian women were engaged in solemnizing the Thesmophoria,—a festival celebrated at night, in the open air, in some uninhabited portion of the territory, and without the presence of any male person. As the Chian fugitives entered the Ephesian territory by night, their coming being neither known nor anticipated, it was believed that they were thieves or pirates coming to seize the women, and under this error they were attacked by the Ephesians and slain.[3] It would seem from this incident that the Ephesians had taken no part in the Ionic revolt, nor are they mentioned amidst the various

Complete victory of the Persian fleet at Ladê—ruin of the Ionic fleet—severe loss of the Chians.

[1] Herodot. vi. 13. [2] Herodot. vi. 14, 15. [3] Herodot. vi. 16.

contingents; nor is anything said either of Kolophôn, or Lebedus, or Eræ.[1]

The Phôkæan Dionysius, perceiving that the defeat of Ladê was the ruin of the Ionic cause, and that his native city was again doomed to Persian subjection, did not think it prudent even to return home. Immediately after the battle he set sail, not for Phôkæa, but for the Phœnician coast, at this moment stripped of its protecting cruisers. He seized several Phœnician merchantmen, out of which considerable profit was obtained: then setting sail for Sicily, he undertook the occupation of a privateer against the Carthaginians and Tyrrhenians, abstaining from injury towards Greeks.[2] Such an employment seems then to have been considered perfectly admissible. A considerable body of Samians also migrated to Sicily, indignant at the treachery of their admirals in the battle, and yet more indignant at the approaching restoration of their despot Æakês. How these Samian emigrants became established in the Sicilian town of Zanklê,[3] I shall mention as a part of the course of Sicilian events, which will come hereafter.

Voluntary exile and adventures of Dionysius.

The victory of Ladê enabled the Persians to attack Milêtus by sea as well as by land; they prosecuted the siege with the utmost vigour, by undermining the walls, and by various engines of attack. Their resources in this respect seem to have been enlarged since the days of Harpagus. In no long time the city was taken by storm, and miserable was the fate reserved to it. The adult male population was chiefly slain; while such of them as were preserved, together with the women and children, were sent in a body to Susa to await the orders of Darius, who assigned to them a residence at Ampê, not far from the mouth of the Tigris. The temple at Branchidæ was burnt and pillaged, as Hekatæus had predicted at the beginning of the revolt. The large treasures therein contained must have gone far to defray the costs of the Persian army. The Milesian territory is said to have been altogether denuded of its former

B.C. 496—495.

Siege, capture, and ruin of Milêtus by the Persians.

1 Thucyd. viii. 14.

2 Herodot. vi. 17. λῃΐστῃς κατεστήκεε, Ἑλλήνων μὲν οὐδενὸς, Καρχηδονίων δὲ καὶ Τυρσηνέων.

3 Herodot. vi. 22—25.

inhabitants—the Persians retaining for themselves the city with the plain adjoining to it, and making over the mountainous portions to the Karians of Pedasa. Some few of the Milesians found a place among the Samian emigrants to Sicily.[1] It is certain however that the new Grecian inhabitants must have been subsequently admitted into Milêtus; for it appears ever afterwards as a Grecian town, though with diminished power and importance.

The capture of Milêtus, in the sixth year from the commencement of the revolt,[2] carried with it the rapid submission of the

[1] Herodot. vi. 18, 19, 20, 22.

Μίλητος μέν νυν Μιλησίων ἐρήμωτο.

[2] Herodot. vi. 18. αἱρέουσι κατ' ἄκρης ἕκτῳ ἔτεϊ ὑπὸ τῆς ἀποστάσιος τῆς Ἀρισταγόρεω. This is almost the only distinct chronological statement which we find in Herodotus respecting the Ionic revolt. The other evidences of time in his chapters are more or less equivocal: nor is there sufficient testimony before us to enable us to arrange the events, between the commencement of the Ionic revolt and the battle of Marathôn, into the precise years to which they belong. The battle of Marathôn stands fixed for September 490 B.C.: the siege of Milêtus may probably have been finished in 496—495 B.C., and the Ionic revolt may have begun in 502—501 B.C. Such are the dates which, on the whole, appear to me most probable, though I am far from considering them as certain.

Chronological critics differ considerably in their arrangement of the events here alluded to among particular years. See Appendix No. 5, p. 244, in Mr. Clinton's Fasti Hellenici; Professor Schultz, Beiträge zu genaueren Zeitbestimmungen von der 63. zur 72. Olympiade, p. 177—183, in the Kieler Philologische Studien; and Weissenborn, Beiträge zur genaueren Erforschung der alten Griechischen Geschichte, Jena, 1844, p. 87 *seqq.*: not to mention Reiz and Larcher. Mr Clinton reckons only ten years from the beginning of the Ionic revolt to the battle of Marathôn; which appears to me too short, though, on the other hand, the fourteen years reckoned by Larcher—much more the sixteen years reckoned by Reiz—are too long. Mr. Clinton compresses inconveniently the latter portion of the interval—that portion which elapsed between the siege of Milêtus and the battle of Marathôn: and the very improbable supposition to which he is obliged to resort—of a confusion in the language of Herodotus between Attic and Olympic years—indicates that he is pressing the text of the historian too closely when he states "that Herodotus specifies a term of three years between the capture of Milêtus and the expedition of Datis": see F. H. ad ann. 499. He places the capture of Milêtus in 494 B.C.; which I am inclined to believe a year later—if not two years later—than the reality. Indeed as Mr. Clinton places the expedition of Aristagoras against Naxos (which was *immediately before* the breaking out of the revolt, since Aristagoras seized the Ionic despots while that fleet yet remained congregated immediately at the close of the expedition) in 501 B.C. and as Herodotus expressly says that Milêtus was taken in the sixth year after the revolt, it would follow that this capture ought to belong to 495, and not to 494 B.C. I incline to place it either in 496 or in 495; and the Naxian expedition in 502 or 501, leaning towards the earlier of the two dates: Schultz agrees with Larcher in placing the Naxian expedition in 504 B.C., yet he assigns the capture of Milêtus to 496 B.C.—whereas Herodotus states that the last of these two events was in the sixth year after the revolt, which revolt immediately succeeded on the first of the two, within the same summer. Weissenborn places the capture of Milêtus in 496 B.C., and the expedition to Naxos in 499—suspecting that the text in Herodotus—ἕκτῳ ἔτεϊ—is incorrect, and that it ought to be τετάρτῳ ἔτεϊ, the fourth year (p. 125: compare the chronological table in his

neighbouring towns in Karia; and during the next summer—the Phœnician fleet having wintered at Milêtus—the Persian forces by sea and land reconquered all the Asiatic Greeks, insular as well as continental.[1] Chios, Lesbos, and Tenedos—the towns in the Chersonese—Selymbria and Perinthus in Thrace—Prokonnêsus and Artakê in the Propontis—all these towns were taken or sacked by the Persian and Phœnician fleet.[2] The inhabitants of Byzantium and Chalkêdôn fled for the most part, without even awaiting its arrival, to Mesembria; while the Athenian Miltiadês only escaped Persian captivity by a rapid flight from his abode in the Chersonese to Athens. His pursuers were indeed so close upon him, that one of his ships, with his son Metiochus on board, fell into their hands. As Miltiadês had been strenuous in urging the destruction of the bridge over the Danube, on the occasion of the Scythian expedition, the Phœnicians were particularly anxious to get possession of his person, as the most acceptable of all Greek prisoners to the Persian king; who however, when Metiochus the son of Miltiadês was brought to Susa, not only did him no harm, but treated him with great kindness, and gave him a Persian wife with a comfortable maintenance.[3]

The Phœnician fleet reconquers all the coast-towns and islands.

Narrow escape of Miltiadês from their pursuit.

Far otherwise did the Persian generals deal with the reconquered cities on and near the coast. The threats which had been held out before the battle of Ladê were realised to the full. The most beautiful Greek youths and virgins were picked out, to be distributed among the Persian grandees as eunuchs or inmates of the harems. The cities, with their edifices sacred as well as profane, were made a

Cruelties of the Persians after the reconquest.

work, p. 222). He attempts to show that the particular incidents composing the Ionic revolt, as Herodotus recounts it, cannot be made to occupy more than four years; but his reasoning is in my judgment unsatisfactory, and the conjecture inadmissible. The distinct affirmation of the historian, as to the entire interval between the two events, is of much more evidentiary value than our conjectural summing up of the details.

It is vain, I think, to try to arrange these details according to precise years: this can only be done very loosely.

[1] Herodot. vi. 25.

[2] Herodot. vi. 31—33. It may perhaps be to this burning and sacking of the cities in the Propontis and on the Asiatic side of the Hellespont that Strabo (xiii. p. 591) makes allusion; though he ascribes the proceeding to a different cause—to the fear of Darius that the Scythians would cross into Asia to avenge themselves upon him for attacking them, and that the towns on the coast would furnish them with vessels for the passage.

[3] Herodot. vi. 41.

prey to the flames; and in the case of the islands, Herodotus even tells us that a line of Persians was formed from shore to shore, which swept each territory from north to south, and drove the inhabitants out of it.[1] That much of this hard treatment is well founded, there can be no doubt. But it must be exaggerated as to extent of depopulation and destruction, for these islands and cities appear ever afterwards as occupied by a Grecian population, and even as in a tolerable, though reduced condition. Samos was made an exception to the rest, and completely spared by the Persians, as a reward to its captains for setting the example of desertion at the battle of Ladê; while Æakês the despot of that island was reinstated in his government.[2] It appears that several other despots were reinstated at the same time in their respective cities, though we are not told which.

Amidst the sufferings endured by so many innocent persons, of every age and of both sexes, the fate of Histiæus excites but little sympathy. He was carrying on his piracies at Byzantium when he learnt the surrender of Milêtus; he then thought it expedient to sail with his Lesbian vessels for Chios, where admittance was refused to him. But the Chians, weakened as they had been by the late battle, were in little condition to resist, so that he defeated their troops and despoiled the island. During the present break-up of the Asiatic Greeks, there were doubtless many who (like the Phôkæan Dionysius) did not choose to return home to an enslaved city, yet had no fixed plan for a new abode. Of these exiles, a considerable number put themselves under the temporary command of Histiæus, and accompanied him to the plunder of Thasos.[3] While besieging that town, he learnt the news that the Phœnician fleet had quitted Milêtus to attack the remaining Ionic towns. He therefore left his designs on Thasos unfinished, in order to go and defend Lesbos. But in this latter island the dearth of provisions was such, that he was forced to cross over to the continent to reap the standing corn, around Atarneus and in the fertile plain of Mysia near the river Kaïkus. Here he fell in with a considerable Persian force under Harpagus—was beaten, compelled to flee, and taken prisoner. On his being carried to

Movements and death of Histiæus.

[1] Herodot. vi. 31, 32, 33.
[2] Herodot. vi. 25.
[3] Herodot. vi. 26—28. ἄγων Ἰώνων καὶ Αἰολέων συχνούς.

Sardis, Artaphernês the satrap caused him to be at once crucified: partly, no doubt, from genuine hatred, but partly also under the persuasion that if he were sent up as a prisoner to Susa, he might again become dangerous, since Darius would even now spare his life, under an indelible sentiment of gratitude for the maintenance of the bridge over the Danube. The head of Histiæus was embalmed and sent up to Susa, where Darius caused it to be honourably buried, condemning this precipitate execution of a man who had once been his preserver.[1]

B.C. 494—493. Sympathy and terror of the Athenians at the capture of Milêtus—the tragic writer Phrynichus is fined.

We need not wonder that the capture of Milêtus excited the strongest feeling of mixed sympathy and consternation among the Athenians. In the succeeding year (so at least we are led to think, though the date cannot be positively determined) it was selected as the subject of a tragedy—The Capture of Milêtus—by the dramatic poet Phrynichus; which, when performed, so painfully wrung the feelings of the Athenian audience, that they burst into tears in the theatre, and the poet was condemned to pay a fine of one thousand drachmæ, as "having recalled to them their own misfortunes".[2] The piece was forbidden to be afterwards acted, and has not come down to us. Some critics have supposed that Herodotus has not correctly assigned the real motive which determined the Athenians to impose this fine;[3] for it is certain that the subjects usually selected for tragedy were portions of heroic legend, and not matters of recent history; so that the Athenians might complain of Phrynichus on the double ground—for having violated an established canon of propriety, as well as for touching their sensibilities too deeply. Still I see no reason for doubting that the cause assigned by Herodotus is substantially the true one. Yet it is very possible that Phrynichus, at an age when tragic poetry had not yet reached its full development, might touch this very tender subject with a rough and offensive hand, before a people who had fair reason to dread the like cruel fate for themselves. Æschylus, in his Persæ, would naturally carry

1 Herodot. vi. 28, 29, 30.

2 Herodot. v. 21. ὡς ἀναμνήσαντα οἰκηΐα κακά; compare vii. 152; also Kallisthenês ap. Strabo, xiv. p. 635. and Plutarch, Præcept. Reipubl. Gerend. p. 814.

3 See Welcker, Griechische Tragödien, vol. i. p. 25.

with him the full tide of Athenian sympathy, while dwelling on the victories of Salamis and Platæa. But to interest the audience in Persian success and Grecian suffering was a task in which much greater poets than Phrynichus would have failed, and which no judicious poet would have undertaken. The sack of Magdeburg by Count Tilly, in the Thirty Years' War, was not likely to be endured as the subject of dramatic representation in any Protestant town of Germany.

END OF VOL. III.

ABERDEEN UNIVERSITY PRESS.

00002770

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 05 October, 2018